

Brooklyn Center SHIP Community-Based Participatory Evaluation Report

City of Brooklyn Center Park and Recreation, Brooklyn Bridge Alliance
for Youth, Hennepin County SHIP

Chia Xiong, Data, Evaluation and YPAR Coordinator

Vshin Yang, MSW Intern

Rebecca Gilgen, Executive Director

Community Advisory Group:

- Rachel Salzer, Brooklyn Center Rec Staff
- Brenda Morales Silva
- Masal Ibrahim
- Ruwaina Fadul

Background

The Hennepin County Statewide Improvement Partnership (SHIP) has provided key investment in the City of Brooklyn Center Parks and Recreation Department's (BC Rec) efforts in developing their capacity; by changing policy, processes, programs and services to expand equitable access. The BC Rec's partnership with the Brooklyn Bridge Alliance for Youth (BBAY) expanded this work to focus on learning from year 2 results and embedding equity practices into day-to-day—spearheading the need to gather feedback from the community.

The overarching department goal:

- Engage the community to review and assess community needs, perceptions, access to, utilization of, and gather recommendations for learning and improvement
- Utilize the results to share with the city's marketing and communication

In partnership with the City's Parks and Recreation Department, BBAY conducted the Community-Based Participatory Evaluation (CBPE) by gathering a Community Advisory Group to help guide and implement the evaluative work. The Advisory Group consisted of recreation staff, community members focused on various cultural groups and youth. Members of the Community Advisory Group were compensated for their work supporting the design, implementation and evaluation of the comprehensive CBPE.

Purpose

The Community-Based Participatory Evaluation (CBPE) was conducted to gather direct input from community members regarding the department's services, priorities, and areas for improvement. While traditional evaluations often rely on internal assessments or quantitative metrics, engaging the community in this process is uncommon and can be time-consuming. Recognizing the value of firsthand perspectives, the SHIP initiative between the City and BBAY sought to actively involve community members to ensure their voices and experiences helped inform decision-making within their community.

The primary objectives of this evaluation were to gather community insight to review and assess the needs of the community, their perceptions, the access to recreation, utilization of, and obtain recommendations. By fostering an inclusive and participatory approach, this evaluation aimed to strengthen the relationship between BC Rec's team and the community it serves, promote transparency, and support the development of programs and services that are responsive to the community's priorities.

Evaluation Question

Primary Outcome Question

The main goal of this evaluation was to understand the impact of BC Rec's recent equity effort. Specifically, the evaluation sought to answer:

What are the community's needs and perceptions, especially non-users, regarding Brooklyn Center Parks and Recreation, and how should those needs be addressed?

This question focused on anyone with the emphasis on current non-users of BC Rec's services, with particular attention to equity, inclusion, and access. The aim was to capture authentic community perspectives to guide improvements in programming, outreach, and service delivery.

Methodology

Approach

This evaluation followed a Community-Based Participatory Evaluation (CBPE) approach, emphasizing collaboration and shared ownership with community members throughout all stages. This process was designed to ensure that evaluation activities were relevant, culturally appropriate, and beneficial to the community. The methodology consisted of three main phases: (1) formation of the Community Advisory Group, (2) exploration of evaluation methods, and (3) implementation of the evaluation with analysis of the data collected.

1. Gathering a Community Advisory Group

To guide the evaluation design and ensure community perspectives were central, a Community Advisory Group (CAG) was established. Members were recruited through internal networks, outreach through networks and newsletters, and community leaders to ensure representation

across demographics, interests, and lived experiences. From those recruited, the CAG members consisted of 2 Brooklyn Center Recreation staff and 3 youth who live in the city.

The Advisory Group met regularly to hone their evaluation skills, co-develop the evaluation plan, review data collection methods, implement the evaluation, and analyze data collected. Their input shaped key aspects of the design, including recruitment strategies, consent procedures, and the format of evaluation materials. Community members received compensation for their time and contributions to acknowledge their expertise and labor.

2. Pilot Evaluation at a Community Event

Following the initial meetings with the Advisory Group, a trial implementation of evaluation was conducted at a local community event – the Juneteenth Celebration held by the cities of Brooklyn Park and Brooklyn Center. During the event, members engaged attendees in conversation about their usage of parks in the area, what they would like to see from the City’s Parks and Recreation, and how they find out about events in the community. The purpose of the trial was to test the feasibility, clarity, and cultural relevance of an evaluation tool in a real-world setting. Insights from this pilot phase informed refinements to the evaluation tool later created and procedures prior to data collection on a broader scale.

3. Community Interviews

After the pilot run, the Community Advisory Group collectively decided to use interviews as the primary evaluation tool after careful considerations of various evaluation tools. The group determined that interviews would allow for a more personal and in-depth understanding of community members’ experiences, perspectives, and needs—particularly given the diverse demographics within the community.

The Advisory Group co-developed the interview guide, ensuring that questions were clear, culturally relevant, and aligned with the key CBPE themes identified (see Appendix E. Interview Questions):

1. Interests, Participation, and Awareness
2. Barriers and Accessibility
3. Community Experience and Inclusion

These themes were identified through a Consensus Workshop guiding the group through a series of questions and ideas gathering on what information needed to be gathered to answer the main evaluation question. Interview participants were intentionally recruited to reflect a broad range of ages, backgrounds, and experiences, allowing for varied perspectives on engagement with the city’s recreation programs and services.

For the community interviews, Advisory Group members were tasked with identifying and interviewing up to five community members each. Priority population groups included non-users of recreation programs and services, teens, parents, older adults, individuals with disabilities, adults without children, and members of cultural communities such as African American, African (e.g. Nigerian, Liberian), Asian (e.g. Hmong, Vietnamese, Lao), and Hispanic/Latino groups.

This approach ensured that voices from a wide cross section of the community were included in the evaluation.

Interviews were conducted in person. Conversations were either audio-recorded and transcribed or documented with hand-written notes, depending on the setting and participation comfort. All participants provided informed consent and received compensation for their time, recognizing their contributions to enhancing community access and connection to the city's recreation programs and services.

Data were analyzed thematically through a participatory process through Advisory Group discussions, interview notes, and transcribed interviews. Preliminary themes and interpretations were shared with the advisory group, who contributed to refining the analysis and contextualizing findings based on their community knowledge and lived experiences.

Ethical Considerations

This project adhered to ethical principles of respect, reciprocity, and shared benefit. Informed consent was obtained for all data collected, and confidentiality was maintained throughout. The participatory design of the evaluation aimed to minimize power imbalances between community and project lead, with community partners engaged as co-creators rather than subjects of study.

Results

Overview

This section presents the findings from the Community-Based Participatory Evaluation, including insights from the Community Advisory Group, observations from the pilot evaluation, and themes that emerged from the community interviews. The results are organized around key CBPE themes identified by the Advisory Group: interests, participation and awareness, barriers and accessibility, and community experience and inclusion.

1. Community Advisory Group Insights

The Advisory Group played a central role in shaping the evaluation design from beginning to end and interpreting early findings. Members highlighted several key areas of focus for the evaluation: equitable access to recreation programs, cultural relevance, and inclusive evaluation strategies. They also provided guidance on question design and interpretation of data to ensure community perspectives were accurately represented.

Insights from identifying themes:

- Access and equity
 - Considerations of services to help with language support
 - Being unaware of programs
 - Other competing concerns such as childcare needs (for parents to participate)
- Program relevance
 - Personal motivation to go to the parks or participate in recreation programs
 - Other recreation programs folks attend outside of the city's programs

- Engagement strategies
 - Understanding where and how people hear about recreation programs
 - Personal relationships drive the motivation to attend events (e.g. friends invite, family members already attending, social circle informs them)

The Advisory Group's reflections informed the overall evaluation ensuring it remained participatory and community centered.

2. Pilot Evaluation at a Community Event

The pilot evaluation at the Juneteenth event provided valuable feedback on the feasibility and clarity of evaluation tools (see results in Appendix B. Juneteenth Results). A diverse group of community members attended, including families, teens, and older adults.

What we found from the pilot evaluation was the inability to engage in deeper understanding from community members' perspectives and experiences, particularly regarding the barriers to participating in recreation programs or services. There was also minimal time and space to provide substantial feedback on how best to engage with the priority populations identified.

These observations highlighted the need for a more personal, in-depth approach to data collection. As a result, the Advisory Group shifted to the interviews as the primary evaluation method to allow for richer insights from diverse community members.

3. Community Interviews

The interviews conducted by the Community Advisory Group members generated rich insights about the community's experiences and perspectives on recreation programs. In total, 11 interviews were conducted by the Advisory Group members. Interviews included participants from diverse backgrounds, including non-users of recreation programs and services, teens, parents, older adults, adults without children, and members of various cultural groups.

3.1 Interests, Participation, and Awareness

Community interests ranged in different directions. Some expressed interest in city clean-ups, sports (e.g. basketball, soccer, badminton, roller skating), educational programs like English, Spanish, math classes, and creative or entrepreneurial pursuits, such as writing a book or developing small business skills.

"I know there's a lot of people that are very skilled in our community but don't have the access to bring their vision to life, and small business I think is also another way to bring many new investments into the community." - Hispanic Woman

Community members reported learning about city events and programs through a mix of print materials, social media, and word-of-mouth. Several residents mentioned receiving information from city newsletters, which they appreciated for highlighting a range of activities. Others noted that social media platforms, particularly Facebook, play a key role in discovering events—often through suggested posts or shared community pages.

“When it’s advertised to different people who are just like me, meaning it could be skin color or even religion, then that would make me feel more welcome.” - African Brooklyn Center High School Student

In addition to those mentioned above, personal networks remain a vital channel. Many community members noted they learn about opportunities through family members, or information community conversations, emphasizing the importance of trust and community connection in communication.

Overall, community members interviewed are hearing about opportunities, are interested in a variety of topics, but the feedback suggests that consistent, multilingual communication and accessible online outreach could strengthen awareness and participation across different cultural communities.

3.2 Barriers and Accessibility

The interviews reported several obstacles in participating in recreation programs, including insufficient awareness, scheduling or life conflicts, language barriers, and transportation. Many noted how they are not aware of events or opportunities, or they don’t see activities that interest them.

“We live so close to the community place...I just haven’t been aware. I haven’t really seen much of anything I like.” - 20s African Female

One interview question focused on Police presence in spaces which garnered mixed responses but generally balanced feelings toward police presence in city spaces. Several responded feeling both nervous and reassured, noting that police presence may contribute to a sense of safety. Others shared that while they value having police available for protection and emergency response, there are ongoing concerns about how police interactions are handled, with calls for improved communication, processes, and community relations.

Community feedback highlighted that language remains a significant barrier to accessing and fully engaging in city programs. Participants noted that limited English proficiency can cause difficulties with understanding program materials, registration, and communication during activities. For many residents—particularly those who speak Spanish, Somali, or other languages—there is a need for interpreters, translated materials, and simplified program communication.

Transportation was also mentioned by participants as an ongoing concern in participating in getting to and from different parts of the city. Overall, a central theme in engaging participation in opportunities was to share participant experiences (e.g. reviews of programs and activities) through storytelling and word-of-mouth within trusted networks.

3.3 Community Experience and Inclusion

When interviewed, most participants reported feeling welcomed and safe at Brooklyn Center park spaces. Some noted safety and cleanliness of spaces determined their feelings of being welcomed within city spaces—park workers greeting or saying, “Enjoy the day” or “Have a nice day.” Others mentioned the need for representation—seeing staff or people in the program who look like them (e.g. Hispanic, Hijabi, speaking familiar languages). Many emphasized the importance of their social network in participating in activities. This was mentioned in various ways:

- Family involvement—activities that incorporate the whole family
- Knowing a friend who is going and being invited to go
- Having a familiar face there—staff members, volunteers, or participants
 - This is also relevant to who is doing recruitment and outreach and connecting with the same person as they attend the event
- Events to be community-centered and community-driven
 - Having community members partner in putting events together (e.g. asking the community what they would like to see during Hispanic Heritage Month so community can see themselves in it and be empowered by it—rather than the city planning it and having the community come)

“I have yet to check out the place, so I think maybe I’ll start with those free passes.” - African Female in her 20s regarding receiving discounted coupons to the community center as compensation for being interviewed

4. Data Analysis of Interviews

In addition to conducting interviews, the Community Advisory Group played a key role in the analysis and interpretation of the data collected. Advisory Group members helped identify and organize emerging themes from the interview into four categories: community perceptions—what people have experienced at parks and activities, needs/wants—community interests in wanting to see opportunities at the city, barriers—reflecting gaps in accessibility, and recommendations—providing concrete suggestions from participants for improving engagement and inclusion. This is reflected in Table 1. Interview Findings below.

Table 1. Interview Findings

| <u>Perceptions</u> | <u>Needs/Wants</u> |
|---|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Appreciated cultural events in past hosted by the city – food, music, people ● Some positive, some negative, and some indifferent perceptions about Brooklyn Center Police presence ● Positive experiences going to the community center and park spaces - clear and available ● Community trust on one another - personable invites | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Classes around skill-building for adults (languages such as English or Spanish, math, entrepreneurial) ● Accessible clean drinking water at the parks ● Sports opportunities for youth (i.e. badminton, volleyball, soccer) ● Teen-specific activities without parents or kids ● Less shootings |

| | |
|--|---|
| <p><u>Barriers</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Language - limited English proficiency, help with registration, needing interpretation during activities • Transportation - limited available routes or lack of personal transportation options • Unaware - not knowing what is happening • Lack of time - work schedules, being involved in other opportunities | <p><u>Recommendations</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • More community-driven and culturally relevant activities • Representation of the community within recreation and parks (i.e. Hispanic, Hijabi) • Outreach in places people already go to such as the schools, libraries, etc. – spread flyers and tell people about it • Incorporate the whole family at events and essential resources - low cost/free, health resources/services |
|--|---|

5. Cross-Cutting Themes

Throughout the CBPE, several findings emerged across participant groups and themes:

- The value of personal engagement in outreach and evaluation.
- Community desire for consistent, culturally inclusive communication.
- Strong appreciation for participatory approaches that allow community members to influence programs.

The Community Advisory Group emphasized how engaging and informative the Community-Based Participatory Evaluation process was. They also appreciated the city's efforts in engaging the community in such a system and would recommend that future evaluation efforts continue to center community voices.

Challenges

While conducting the evaluation, thoughtful considerations were taken in both methodology and development to ensure that the evaluation was aligned with an equitable, Community-Based Participatory Evaluation framework. However, there were still some challenges present that contributed to possible limitations that the evaluation team have identified.

One challenge that was present was regarding the scale of which the evaluation was conducted, being that the Brooklyn Center SHIP evaluation work was being conducted alongside a parallel evaluation for Brooklyn Park that also aimed to collect community needs, perceptions, and recommendations for their city's parks and recreation department through participatory methods. The presenting limitation regarding this dual-city approach was the complexity of managing two separate, yet interrelated, projects simultaneously. Each city had distinct community dynamics, resident relationships, and questions which required the evaluation team to carefully navigate these city contexts. Upon reflection of the project, the question was raised if a joint evaluation effort may have been more effective or whether

separate, city-specific evaluations would have allowed for more deeper community engagement and data instead.

Another significant challenge of the evaluation involved recruiting and retaining community members onto the Community Advisory Group. Throughout the entire process of the evaluation, the CAG was an integral part of bridging community voices into the conducting and development of the SHIP evaluation, however maintaining consistent participation was something that the evaluation team faced difficulty with. Specifically, members faced scheduling conflicts and personal commitments, such as school or work, that occasionally limited their involvement. Additionally, ensuring representation from all priority population groups was an ongoing effort throughout the evaluation process that was a presenting challenge for the project. Despite intentional outreach and engagement strategies, some groups remained underrepresented in the advisory group and interview data such as residents experiencing disability.

Timing and scheduling were also another significant challenge that was faced by the evaluation team when conducting this evaluation project. The evaluation took place over a relatively short period, requiring the team to simultaneously build relationships, develop the evaluation design, and implement data collection within 6-7 meetings. The process ultimately expanded to ten to accommodate deeper discussion, engagement, and availability of the Advisory Group members. Thus, being grounded in community-based frameworks of evaluation required the evaluation team to be flexible to community members' needs which conflicted with the time-intensive nature of the evaluation plan.

Alongside challenges in evaluation process and development, data collection and transcription presented logistical challenges for this evaluation project. Namely, a considerable amount of interview recordings was affected by background noise or technical issues, which made it difficult to fully capture participant responses during transcription. Moreover, despite the evaluation team's best efforts, it was challenging to reach all priority population groups through the interview process, which may have limited the comprehensiveness of perspectives represented in the findings.

Final Summary

This Community-Based Participatory Evaluation provided valuable insights into community experiences, barriers, and opportunities related to Brooklyn Center's Parks and Recreation programs and services. By engaging in a Community Advisory Group throughout the process, the evaluation prioritized community perspectives, ensuring that findings reflected the needs, interests, and lived experiences of diverse populations, including teens, older adults, non-users of programs, and members of culturally diverse groups.

The evaluation process—including the pilot trial at Juneteenth and interviews—revealed important themes around community experiences and perceptions, community interests, barriers to access, and recommendations. While the pilot trial at Juneteenth highlighted challenges in

gathering in-depth feedback, the shift to interviews enabled richer, more nuanced insights from community members across priority populations. The participatory design also strengthened community trust and fostered meaningful engagement in the evaluation process.

A key component of this work was the active involvement of the Community Advisory Group. The BC Rec team was invited to gather together with the Community Advisory Group to hear about the CBPE process and results of the evaluation. The Advisory Group members shared their experience as part of the evaluation work and showcased results through a presentation highlighting major themes (as listed above). This allowed for department leadership and staff to engage directly with community voices, highlighting both challenges and opportunities, emphasizing priority populations, and offering actionable recommendations. The whole group was led through brainstorming actionable items from this work and how to tell the stories of impact regarding such themes the BC Rec team has already been working on (3 one-page articles). From there, the BC Rec team gathered one more time to solidify key action areas for ongoing equity work in response to the CBPE work (Appendix F. Brooklyn Center Recreation CBPE Consensus Workshop - Key Action Areas).

Overall, this evaluation demonstrates the value of community-based participatory approaches in understanding and addressing community needs. By centering resident perspectives and engaging community partners as co-creators, the Recreation Department gained actionable insights that can inform program design, marketing, outreach, and long-term strategic priorities. The collaboration also established a foundation for ongoing community engagement and participatory evaluation in future initiatives.

Appendix A. Community Advisory Group Flyer



Brooklyn Bridge
ALLIANCE
for YOUTH

Recruitment for Community Advisory Group

The city, in partnership with the Brooklyn Bridge Alliance for Youth, is looking for community members to join an Advisory Team. This team will help review how the Parks and Recreation Department affects different community groups.

We are looking for folks who are:

- Recent newcomers to Brooklyn Center
- Bilingual
- Apartment residents
- No or little experience with recreation services
- Can commit to several meetings between May – Sept

**Stipend Compensation Available*

Sign Up Here:

Scan QR code
with phone
Contact Chia Xiong
(call/text 612-860-
0025 or
Chia.Xiong@brooklyns
allianceforyouth.org



SCAN ME

Sign Up Today!



*This project is in partnership between Brooklyn Center
Parks and Recreation, Brooklyn Bridge Alliance for Youth,
and Hennepin County Public Health SHIP*



Hennepin County
Public Health



Appendix B. Juneteenth Activity + Results

| # of Respondents | Residents of Brooklyn Center | Brooklyn Center Parks Most Visited | What events or programs would you like to see? | How do you find out about events in the community? |
|------------------|------------------------------|---|---|---|
| 18 | 10 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fireside • Centennial • Brookdale • Northport • Palmer • Grandview | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Literacy (financial, entrepreneurial, homebuyer) • Family programs • Community gatherings, specifically centered around building community • More festivals • Outdoor movie nights • Food distribution • Basketball events (e.g. Gusmaker Tournament) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Word of mouth • Facebook • Community centers • Family members who work closely with community • Flyers • Through work • City email • Newsletters |

Brooklyn Center SHIP Interview Instructions

Hi Community Advisory Group Member!

Thank you for your interest and efforts in supporting the Community Based Participatory Evaluation work with the City of Brooklyn Center's Parks and Recreation Department. This interview instruction sheet will help navigate you through the interview process. Reminder that this work is to (goals):

- Engage the community to review and assess community needs, perceptions, access to, utilization of, and gather recommendations for learning and improvement for Brooklyn Center's Park and Recreation Department
- Utilize the results to share with the city's marketing and communication

Selecting Who to Interview:

When selecting community members to be interviewed, we want to ensure that they...

1. Meet 1 or more of the priority population groups identified (e.g. Somali, Hispanic, Hmong, teens, elderly, disabled, adults without kids)
2. They live, work, go to school, or spend a significant time in Brooklyn Center

Recording:

You will have access to [Otter.ai](#) (app) or you can simply record audio of the interview (to be downloaded to be given to Chia or Vshin).

[Otter.ai](#)

Quick Tips & Tricks for Interviews:

- Be prepared with everything you need. Have copies of the consent form, demographic information, and interview questions.
- Deliver a great introduction. Practice this part as much beforehand to put it into your own voice. Be friendly and smile!
- Be safe. Always interview in a public space if you are not familiar with the other person. DO NOT enter any situation that feels unsafe.
- Ask questions clearly and effectively. Read through the questions and practice as much as needed beforehand.
- Have fun! Remember this is important work and uplifts the voices of the community.

Consent Form:

Anyone who is interviewed and recorded NEEDS to fill out the Consent Form! If the individual is under the age of 18, a parent or guardian signature is needed.

Before the Interview:

1. **Familiarize yourself with your interview questions.** Be sure to reach out and connect with other CAG members or Chia and Vshin if you have questions regarding interview questions.
2. Before meeting with a community member to interview them, **have some practice/mock interviews to prepare and develop an understanding** of what might unfold when you conduct the actual interview.
3. Be sure that you have all interview materials ready to go. This would include **supplies for recording, consent forms, writing utensils, and your interview questions.**
4. Communicate with your interviewee to verify the **time and location of the interview.** Be sure that they are prepared and available to be interviewed by you. Find a location that will fit for both you and the interviewee, enclosed space to be easier to listen to one another and record the conversation.

During the Interview:

1. As you and the interviewee settle in, **don't be afraid to break the ice by introducing yourself** and being engaged in some form of orientation before starting. This helps to make the interviewee feel comfortable and connected.
2. **Informed consent is important!!** After settling in and before asking any questions, be sure to let your interviewee know what they are being interviewed for. **Reiterate the purpose of the interview, be transparent** about what their responses will contribute towards, **and ask** if they're comfortable if you take any notes and are recorded to be transcribed (the recordings will not be shared).
3. **Hold space for conversation** as you're interviewing. Allow room for silence and pause, follow-up questions, feelings and emotions, and story telling as people share their responses to your questions.
4. **Go with the flow.** Pace the interview with what's comfortable for both you and the interviewee, and **don't be afraid to ask clarifying questions** if that is needed.

Wrapping up and After the Interview

1. As you're wrapping up your interview, be sure to ask the interviewee if they have any questions or concerns they'd want to share with you at all.
2. **Share the next steps** with your interviewee. Be sure to outline what they can expect after the interview is over - We will be sharing the results of interviews to the City of Brooklyn Center's Parks and Recreation department and potentially to the wider Brooklyn Center teams and partners.
3. **THANK YOUR INTERVIEWEE!!!** Express gratitude for their time and responses, it is not only courteous but it's how we honor and respect their experiences and time with us.
4. After the interview, find some time to **review your notes.** Note some highlights from what you collected, fill in any gaps that you may have left, or clean up any thoughts you may have written down.

Appendix D. Consent Form + Demographics



Brooklyn Bridge
ALLIANCE
YOUTH



Hennepin County
Public Health



Purpose of the Research

The city, in partnership with the Brooklyn Bridge Alliance for Youth and Hennepin County, has been focused on advancing equity throughout the department. This work has provided a key investment in the City of Brooklyn Center Recreation department's efforts to increase equitable access through efforts to identify and change policy, process, and programming. This year, our approach will provide information about how progress has been experienced by the community by creating the Community Advisory Group to engage the community in reflecting and sharing their needs and perceptions regarding Brooklyn Center Recreation department.

Procedures

This interview will take somewhere between 10-20 minutes and be recorded so we can make sure to remember all the details you provide. You will be compensated for your time. If at any time you feel uncomfortable with a question, you can let your interviewer know and can skip that question or end the interview.

Confidentiality

All of the information you share with us will be anonymous to the public. However, we will use non-identifying quotes. Your name or other identifying markers about yourself will be kept confidential. We will need to collect your contact information in case we need to reach back out to you.

Contact Information

Name: _____

Phone Number: _____

Email: _____

Consent

By signing below, you agree to participate in this interview.

Participant Name: _____ Date: _____

Participant Signature: _____

*If the participant is under the age of 18, you will need a Parent/Guardian to sign.

For any questions, please contact Chia Xiong at (call/text) 612-860-0025 or email
Chia.Xiong@brooklynsallianceforyouth.org

Demographic Information

These are optional, but we encourage you to complete this section to help us ensure we reflect and support the diversity of the community. Your responses are confidential and will only be used in planning and reporting purposes. You may skip any questions you prefer not to answer.

Which area in Brooklyn Center do you live or visit often?

Directional (north, east, south, west, NW, etc.), near Palmer Lake or Twin Lake, near the high school, etc.

How many people are in your household? _____

Age Group of the person interviewing

- | | |
|----------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> 0 - 12 | <input type="checkbox"/> 40 - 49 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 13 - 19 | <input type="checkbox"/> 50 - 59 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 20 - 29 | <input type="checkbox"/> 60 - 69 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 30 - 39 | <input type="checkbox"/> 70 + |

How do you describe yourself? (Check all that apply.)

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> African (Liberian, Oromo, Somali, etc.) | <input type="checkbox"/> Native American or American Indian |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Asian (Chinese, Hmong, Lao, Vietnamese, South Asian, etc.) | <input type="checkbox"/> Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Black American | <input type="checkbox"/> White or European American |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Hispanic or Latino/a | <input type="checkbox"/> Prefer not to say |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Another race or ethnicity (please specify): _____ | |

What gender do you identify with? (Check one.)

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Female | <input type="checkbox"/> Non-binary / Third gender |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Male | <input type="checkbox"/> Prefer not to say |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Prefer to self-describe: _____ | |

Appendix E. Interview Questions

Brooklyn Center Interview Questions

Introduce yourself..

1. What are some activities you currently enjoy doing?
2. Do you know if the city currently provides events or programs that interest you? If they did, what would make you participate?
3. What programs or activities would interest you if the city provided it?
4. Are there other places you currently go for activities or programs instead? If so, why?
5. How do you find out about events or programs in the community?
6. If you speak another language other than English, how have you (or your community) faced difficulties in accessing programs or events in the past? *This can include registering for programs, being at the program and needing interpretation, and/or having things written in different languages.*
7. *I'm going to read out a list for you - you tell me whether or not you have faced any of these challenges or obstacles when trying to access programs or events in the past?*
 - a. Transportation - getting to and from the place
 - b. Cost
 - c. Time - time of day/time of week/personal schedule/not a priority
 - d. Childcare
 - e. Being unaware
 - f. Disability support
8. What would make you feel welcomed within city space or parks?
9. What would motivate you to go to events and activities in the parks or within the city?
 - a. *This could be examples like going with a friend or family, knowing someone at the event, it's free/low cost, close to home...*
10. How do you feel about the presence of the Brooklyn Center police department?
11. What events or programs have you attended in the past at the city of Brooklyn Center, also including using the community center (fitness area, swimming pool)?
 - a. What was your experience like?
12. Any additional comments or questions?

Appendix F. Brooklyn Center Recreation CBPE Consensus Workshop - Key Action Areas

Brooklyn Center Recreation Department - CBPE Consensus Workshop
October 14, 2025

| In response to the Community-Based Participatory Evaluation work, what are the key action areas for ongoing equity work? | | |
|--|---|--|
| Increase cultural representation within staff, programs, and events | Refine our offerings to reach those we don't already serve | Intentionally market opportunities for participation in diverse & consistent ways |
| Continue cultural events -> add more cultures | Work with youth in schools more to see what opportunities are missing & what would be useful if we had it available | Re-establish apartment building relationships |
| More cultural events | | Getting information to new and more places |
| Hire more staff that speak multiple languages | Continue growing safe spaces for teens | Duncan + PD video |
| Incorporate celebrating cultures into aquatic events - amplifying staff voices to share their culture | Look into adult classes/offerings | Create master list of places to market programs/events |
| On-site translators | More youth competitive sports | Develop network of trusted messengers to be champions of spreading awareness |
| Representation of food, people, etc., at cultural events | Continue taking aquatics staff to HS/MS & building relationships with people their own age | Talk with current participants about inviting people (add incentives?) |
| | Diversify parks we programming | Advertise through word of mouth more - get trusted community members to become influencers for programs & events |
| | Differ parks programs/events are held at | |
| | Maybe more one-off/flexible programs | |

*Recognizing that residents often move in and out of the community.
Communication approaches need to be iterative and responsive to new groups.