



MEMORANDUM

To: Code Advisory Group Members

From: George Zapalac, Division Manager
Planning & Development Review Department

Sheila Balog, Performance Consultant
Human Resources Department

Date: March 14, 2014

Subject: Agenda Item #1 – Advisory Group Structure

To help guide the discussion for the March 17 meeting agenda item on the structure, organization, and chair of the Advisory Group, we have put together the following options for your consideration:

Option 1 – Staff Facilitator Only. Staff would serve as the single point of contact (SPOC) for Opticos and develop meeting agendas (with CAG input). The meetings would be conducted by the staff facilitator and would remain largely as they have; however, a move to a more structured meeting process is recommended. With the advent of the work-product requirements expected from the CAG, this will be necessary in order to provide timely review and feedback to the consultants. A standard agenda flow would be established and reset for the CAG. Agenda review, committee reports and all conversations would be initiated and facilitated by the facilitator. The facilitator would determine whether adequate discussion has been achieved, direct CAG to vote or determine a next step and, also close each item and move forward with each agenda item.

Option 2 – Chair with Staff Facilitator. In the chair-with-facilitator environment, the Chair would serve as the single point of contact (SPOC) for Opticos. A standard agenda flow would be established and reset for the CAG. The chair would work with staff to develop each agenda item and aid in the planning of each meeting. All agenda items would flow through the Chair (with CAG input), and the Chair would work with staff to determine what is placed on the agenda. The chair could also serve as a spokesperson for any other body wishing to hear feedback on the concerns and issues expressed in the monthly CAG meetings.

In the meetings the Chair would open the meeting and confirm each agenda item. The chair would also open each agenda item and then turn the discussion over to the facilitator whose role

would be to manage the participation of the members, keep the conversation on track and engage members as needed. The facilitator does not influence 'what' is being discussed but rather 'how' it is being discussed. Once the item has been discussed, the facilitator would turn the item back over to the chair for any action to be taken, or to determine the next steps for the item.

During Citizen Communication, the facilitator would manage all of the speakers. The Chair would close the meeting. This is the preferred option as it is important to the success of the CAG that each of the CAG appointees fully participate as a stakeholder in all of the discussions.

Option 3 – Chair without Staff Facilitator. The CAG is not a formal board or commission, and as such would not be 'chaired' in a way that most are. The Chair would have responsibility for working with staff on the agenda development, serve as the single point of contact, and open and initiate agenda items. During the discussions, the Chair would need to remain neutral in order to effectively manage the conversation. In effect, the Chair would lose their voice during meetings. The Chair would also be responsible for managing the dialogue, relationships and the ground rules established by the group during the first meeting.

Recommendation: The staff recommends Option 2 in order to provide more structure to the Advisory Group while allowing all members to fully participate in the discussion. This option also provides a spokesperson who can represent the group in dealings with City Council and other boards and commissions.

If the group decides on Option 2 or 3, it is recommended that a Vice Chair also be selected to represent the group in the absence of the Chair.