

FLORIDA BUILDING COMMISSION

PRODUCT APPROVAL WORKGROUP— MEETING II

September 30, 2004

Orlando, Florida—Rosen Plaza Hotel
9700 International Drive; 1.800.366.9700

Meeting Objectives

- ✓ To Approve Regular Procedural Topics (Agenda, Report, and Workplan)
- ✓ To Identify Additional Issues Requiring Clarification and/or Revision Related to Existing Process
- ✓ To Propose Options for Identified Issues
- ✓ To Evaluate and Rank Proposed Options
- ✓ To Refine Options Enjoying a High Level of Acceptability
- ✓ To Consider Public Comment
- ✓ To Identify Needed Next Steps and Agenda Items For Next Meeting

Meeting Agenda

9:00	Welcome and Introductions	(DCA)
9:10	Agenda Review and Work Group Plan Overview	(J. Blair)
9:15	Issue Identification and Meeting Scope	(J. Blair)
10:15	Options Identification and Initial Evaluation of Options	(J. Blair)
12:00	<i>Working Lunch (on site)</i>	<i>30 min.</i>
12:30	Ranking/Refinement of Options With a High Level of Acceptability	(J. Blair)
2:40	Public Comment	(J. Blair)
2:50	Next Steps and Agenda Items for Next Meeting	(J. Blair)
	Next meeting agenda items, needed information, location, and date	
3:00	<i>Adjourn</i>	

Contact Information: Jeff Blair; 850.644.6320; jblair@mailier.fsu.edu; <http://consensus.fsu.edu>

PAWG MEMBERSHIP AND REPRESENTATION

Raul L. Rodriguez, AIA, Chair of the Florida Building Commission, has made the following appointments to the Product Approval Work Group (PAWG). Members are charged with representing their stakeholder group's interests, and working with other interest groups to develop a consensus package of recommendations for submittal to the Florida Building Commission.

Members and Representation

Architects

Larry Schneider
Pete Tagliarini

Local Government

George Wiggins

Building Officials

Dale Greiner
Christ Sanidas
Ronnie Spooner

Product Manufacturers

Dave Olmstead
Craig Parrino

Certification Agencies

John Hill

Residential Contractors

Dick Browdy

Engineers

Steve Bassett

Roofing Contractors

Chris Schulte

Evaluation Entities

Herminio Gonzalez

Door Manufacturer

General Contractors

Ed Carson

MEETING SCHEDULE

October 28, 2004
November 25, 2004
December 16, 2004
January 13, 2004

CONSENSUS-BUILDING AND DECISION-MAKING GUIDELINES (Adopted Unanimously August 11, 2004)

Consensus is a **process, an attitude and an outcome**. Consensus processes have the potential of producing better quality, more informed and better-supported outcomes.

As a **process**, consensus is a problem solving approach in which all members:

1. Jointly share, clarify and distinguish their concerns;
2. Educate each other on substantive issues;
3. Jointly develop alternatives to address concerns; and then
4. Seek to adopt recommendations everyone can embrace or at least live with.

In a consensus process, members should be able to honestly say:

- I believe that other members understand my point of view;
- I believe I understand other members' points of view; and
- Whether or not I prefer this decision, I support it because it was arrived at openly and fairly and because it is the best solution we can achieve at this time.

Consensus as an **attitude** means that each member commits to work toward agreements that meet their own and other member needs and interests so that all can support the outcome.

Consensus as an **outcome** means that agreement on decisions is reached by all members or by a significant majority of members after a process of active problem solving. In a consensus outcome, the level of enthusiasm for the agreement may not be the same among all members on any issue, but on balance all should be able to live with the overall package. Levels of consensus on a committee outcome can include a mix of:

- Participants who strongly support the solution;
- Participants who can "live with" the solution; and
- Some participants who do not support the solution but agree not to veto it.

DECISION-MAKING PROCESS

The Product Approval Work Group (PAWG) will seek consensus on a package of recommendations to submit to the Florida Building Commission.

The Work Group's Consensus building and decision making process is a participatory one whereby on matters of substance, the members jointly strive for agreements which all of the members can accept, support or at least agree not to oppose.

In instances where, after vigorously exploring possible ways to enhance the members' support for the final decision on an issue or package of recommendations, and where 100% acceptance or support is not achievable, final recommendations of the Work Group will require at least a 75% favorable vote of all members present and voting. This super majority decision rule underscores the Work Group's view of the importance of seeking and developing agreements with the participation of all members and with which all can live with and support. In the event the Work Group can not reach consensus (100% in favor) on a decision, and for those options that receive at least a 50% favorable vote, a minority report shall be requested immediately following the

vote, articulating the rationales and preferences of those dissenting, and shall be included in the submittal of the package of recommendations.

In order to enhance final consensus recommendations, an amendatory text process may be used at some point in the process.

The Work Group will develop its recommendations using consensus-building techniques with the assistance of the facilitator. Techniques such as brainstorming, ranking and prioritizing approaches will be utilized. Where differences exist that prevent the Work Group from reaching a final consensus decision (i.e. with support of at least 75% of the members) on a recommendation, the Work Group will outline the differences in its documentation.

The Work Group's consensus process will be conducted as an open public work group process consistent with applicable law. Work Group members, staff, and facilitator will be the only participants seated at the table. Only Work Group members may participate in discussions and vote on proposals and recommendations. The facilitator, or a Work Group member through the facilitator, may request specific clarification from a member of the public in order to assist the Work Group in understanding an issue. Observers/members of the public are welcome to speak during the public comment period provided at each meeting, and all comments submitted on the public comment forms provided in the agenda packets will be included in the facilitator's summary reports.

ACCEPTABILITY RANKING SCALE

- 4 Acceptable**—I support proposal as is.
- 3 Minor Reservations**—I can live with this; but would like to see changes as follows. Be prepared to offer specific refinements or changes to address your concerns.
- 2 Major Reservations**—I can't support this unless the following changes are addressed to meet my serious concerns. Be prepared to offer specific refinements or changes to address your concerns.
- 1 Not Acceptable**—I can't support this. Be prepared to offer alternatives and options that would address your own as well as other's concerns.

PRIORITIZATION RANKING SCALE

- 5 Highest Level of Priority; Urgent
- 4 High Priority
- 3 Moderate Level of Priority
- 2 Low Level of Priority
- 1 Lowest Possible Priority; Group Should not Pursue

STRAW POLL CONSENSUS SCALE

- 3 Comfortable**—I support proposal as is. ♥♥♥
- 2 Minor Reservations**—I can live with this; but would like to see changes as follows. ♥♥
- 1 Major Reservations**—I can't support this unless the following changes are addressed to meet my serious concerns. ♥

MEETING GUIDELINES

THE FACILITATOR'S ROLE

- ✓ Guide the meeting process.
- ✓ Provide consensus-building and conflict resolution guidance.
- ✓ Assist members to stay on task.
- ✓ Assure that members follow guidelines and time limits.
- ✓ Facilitate public participation and input.
- ✓ Maintain a record of meeting products.

THE WORK GROUP MEMBER'S ROLE

- ✓ Respect differing perspectives—There are many points of view in the room.
- ✓ State and test your assumptions.
- ✓ Ask lots of questions.
- ✓ Listen to understand.
- ✓ Offering or exploring options does not mean you support it. Be willing to explore ideas you may not agree with.
- ✓ Be focused and concise—Balance participation & minimize repetition—Share the airtime.
- ✓ To the extent possible, offer options to address other's concerns, as well as your own.
- ✓ Avoid stereotyping or personal attacks.
- ✓ Look to the facilitator to be recognized. The facilitator will keep track of those waiting to speak.

GUIDELINES FOR BRAINSTORMING

- ✓ Speak when recognized by facilitator.
- ✓ Offer one idea per person without explanation.
- ✓ No comments, criticism, or discussion of other's ideas.
- ✓ Listen respectfully to other's ideas and opinions.
- ✓ Seek understanding and not agreement at this point in the process.

THE NAME STACKING PROCESS

- ✓ Determines the speaking order.
- ✓ Members raise hand to speak.
- ✓ Facilitator assigns each person a number based on the order he observed person wishing to speak.
- ✓ Facilitator calls on each person in turn, based on the stack order.
- ✓ Facilitator may interrupt the stack (change the speaking order) in order to promote discussion on a specific issue or, to balance participation and allow those who have not spoken on an issue an opportunity to do so before others on the list who have already spoken on the issue.