

Kaka'ako Community Advisory Council
Facilitator Selection Committee – Meeting Notes – 6/5/07

Note: An Executive Summary handout will be distributed at the meeting.
 Meeting notes drafted by Nancy Hedlund – notes include:

1. Purpose of Meeting
2. Agenda
3. Summary of Background Information Reviewed by the Committee, and Questions Considered for Discussion with the Potential Facilitators
4. Summary of Discussion with Potential Facilitators – Karen Cross, Kem Lowry, Marina Piscalish
5. Recommendations of Committee:
 - Select Facilitator Team from UH Matsunaga Peace Institute: Drs. Cross & Lowry,
 - Establish agreement between UH Manoa and HCDA for: a) first six months, and b) subsequent facilitation on quarterly basis for Phase 2
 - Possible Phase 2 “Deliverables” and Timeline
 - Possible terms of agreement between UH and HCDA
6. Follow-Up Comments from Karen Cross Regarding the Work Plan
7. Biographical Summaries on the Three Facilitators Interviewed

1. Purpose of the Meeting

The meeting purpose was to meet with three potential facilitators to discuss questions and ideas relating to facilitation of the Kaka'ako makai advisory group. Based on review of facilitation options discussed at the previous meeting, the Committee agreed to meet with Drs. Karen Cross, Kem Lowry, and Marina Piscalish, all from the Spark M. Matsunaga Peace Institute, part of the UH Manoa Public Policy Center. Brief background summaries for each facilitator are included at the end of these notes.

2. Meeting Agenda

1. Introductions all around – Brief comments on why we are interested in Kaka'ako makai and community advisement to HCDA; introduce Karen Cross, Kem Lowry, Marina Piscalish.
2. Brief history on the situation and our preliminary idea of a timeline - history of community perception that HCDA does not take community views into account; history of various plans to “develop” Kaka'ako; recent history of “smart growth” urban planning with high-end development; and history of community conflict with HCDA over goals/effects of “smart growth” and lack of community participation in decision-making.
3. Discussion of facilitation with facilitator guests, Drs. Cross, Lowry and Piscalish, guided by questions from committee members (see below)
4. Next steps

3. Meeting Background and Questions

Background Information Reviewed by the Committee: The Committee had previously discussed facilitator options including the facilitators available at the UH Matsunaga Institute for Peace. Several of the facilitators from the Institute were recommended by multiple people from the Kaka'ako advisory list. Sources of Committee information also included the UH website and brief biographical summaries on the proposed facilitators that were distributed to Committee members in advance.

Based on the degree of agreement on possible facilitator options, the committee agreed to interview several facilitators from UH and to meet with them at the same time because they work as a team at the Center. The Committee's preparation included review of the facilitators' backgrounds (see summaries at end of meeting notes) and discussion of facilitator responsibilities that include the following:

1. Facilitators will assist the advisory group on the following: Adopting bylaws and electing officers; Reaching agreement on documenting a vision, workplan/timeline, guiding principles and next steps for Kaka`ako makai; Preparing draft recommendations for AWG review; Conducting educational sessions on Kaka`ako makai background and history, land use constraints, opportunities, previous plans and other related information; Maintaining interface with HCDA
2. Facilitators will assist with arrange meeting logistics for meeting and committee meetings (as needed) including: Securing meeting locations; Generating meeting notices; Assisting in developing meeting agendas; Generating meeting summaries; Maintaining email list
3. Facilitator Selection Criteria: Committee discussed: Experience working successfully with community groups in Hawai'i; Knowledge and appreciation of Hawaii's local culture; Experience in managing conflict within groups of diverse people; Experience facilitating community planning processes including keeping discussions and meetings on track; Experience working with diverse groups including state agencies, private sector organizations, including non profits and citizens; Able to maintain neutrality as a facilitator; Able to facilitate "big thinking"

Suggested Questions. A range of questions were planned but the Committee did not adhere strictly to each question. Instead a flow of conversation was created in which the facilitators had opportunities to share their responses to questions such as the following:

1. Are there responsibilities or expectations that fit or don't fit with the facilitator roles defined within the Matsunaga Peace Institute.
2. How long have you lived in Hawai'i? How long have you facilitated in Hawai'i? Tell us about some of your projects that you have facilitated. Tell us about your most rewarding project and why.
3. What process do you see this group going through? Do you see members of the AWG sharing their mana`o in "talk story" sessions with the whole group? in small groups? Should these "talk story" sessions be formalized as part of the process?
4. What kind of homework should the members be doing? In other words, to help the group reach some kind of consensus, what kinds of research or information gathering should we do?
5. Finally, do you see yourselves as being a resource for AWG funding? In other words, do you know of potential grant sources or funding sources that we could tap into to make the visioning process as good as possible? And if you do know of sources, would you be willing to help us to write the grant proposals and to "lobby" on our behalf?

The following questions were also suggested and overlap to some degree with decisions that will be made by the community advisory group and facilitated by the facilitators – whether to bring in outside experts? and what role should HCDA be playing in this process?

4. Summary of Discussion with Potential Facilitators

The three facilitators – Dr. Karen Cross, Kem Lowry, and Marina Piscalish – introduced themselves and shared descriptions of types of work they each have done and that they have all lived and worked in Hawai‘i for many years.

A question was raised about having facilitators identified with “conflict resolution” and whether this carried an expectation that conflict was inevitable or a necessary way of relating. A related concern was whether as facilitators, these individuals would pressure the group to take a specific course of action. Responses included the idea that it is natural in groups to have differences, especially when the focus of the group is something that evokes passionate concerns and ideas. Moreover, it is likely that emotions will come forward in the group’s discussions and these may be associated with discussions in which resolution is desirable. Future discussions will reference the Matsunaga Institute for Peace.

All three facilitators reported experiences working with community groups that are addressing land use issues, or government-led development or plans, or matters involving the public or the community. The facilitators shared their sense that facilitators play an important role in supporting the group in being effective and reinforcing the group’s guiding principles within the group. They emphasized the importance of connections between purpose and principle and relationships as grounding the work of the group. Someone asked if it was possible to separate principle and vision from the more tangible matters of planning and structure. A response suggested there would be a back and forth between this and other seeming dichotomies, as resolutions of issues or differences are sought.

There was discussion about the type of community we are building in the advisory group. Some see it as a highly-engaged “community” with solid relationships and others see it as a less intense group process. Some consideration was given to the group formation as an outcome or a “product” that is still to be defined. This overlaps with vision creation. There was acknowledgement that multiple visions will be articulated as the group proceeds with its work – the vision for the group at the outset, the initial vision for Kaka’ako makai, and the evolving vision that comes with progress and expertise.

A recurring theme was diversity – of people, of ideas, of concerns or interests in Kaka’ako makai. And a related recurring theme was how to honor diversity and create ways of working or planning ideas that engage with the differences. One facilitator reflected that a goal is to design ways and spaces that honor diversity – and the facilitator helps the group to create that space.

The facilitators offered thoughts about how the effectiveness of the group’s work is supported by good facilitation. One example may be advice from the facilitators when it seems that outside expertise would be valuable in helping the group move an idea forward. A question was raised about whether there are successful models for this group to use in advancing a vision and a plan, but the facilitators did not advocate for any specific model. There was much support for the idea that this advisory group would successfully create what it needs to be. A related concern was how we would work with HCDA. One question was how to help advance HCDA’s goals. A different thought was to serve the community first and seek ways to help HCDA by putting the community first.

The facilitators agreed that our group would probably want a steering group – at least that the facilitators would find this helpful. A steering group would be a small number of people who helped take care of details and get the business end of things done. It would not make decisions or chart directions that would bypass the will of the group.

Finally, there was discussion relating to the question of how local culture would influence the facilitators' work and how culture would be accommodated. Responses showed that major themes would be expressed through communication and contexts. For example, not everyone speaks comfortably in large groups so alternative approaches could be the use of small groups or written responses to facilitate a wider range of inputs of ideas on a particular topic or issue.

5. Recommendation of Committee:

- | | |
|--|--|
| a) Recommendation on facilitators | c) Possible Phase 2 deliverables and time frame |
| b) Recommendation on possible timeline | d) Possible terms of agreement between UH and HCDA |

The Committee's recommendations are based on the facilitators' approaches, expectations that were defined before the interviews, and the ideas about the work that were shared during the meeting.

Recommendation #1. A unanimous decision was reached to recommend Drs. Karen Cross and Kem Lowry to serve as primary Phase 2 facilitators.

Dr. Pisolish was recognized as being able to bring a more intensive and, as she described it, *organic* approach to the group's work. This approach engages group members in more intensive exploration of their respective visions, sentiments and values, such that group formation becomes the primary driving force for defining the work to be achieved. This differs from a more structural and process-oriented approach that aims at meeting the goals defined by the group. Many members of the Committee liked both approaches and supported the idea that Dr. Pisolish might be brought in at some point in the process to work with us.

The rationale for selecting Drs. Cross and Lowry included:

- Excellent qualifications with respect to having lived/worked in Hawai'i and record of demonstrated facilitation expertise in Hawai'i
- Good "fit" between the group's anticipated goals and work and the facilitators' experience with land use and government topics and issues
- Evidence of positive partnership between the 2 consultants indicating effective team leadership would be provided to the group
- Respect for UH as a credible sponsoring agency. especially the Matsunaga Institute
- Flexibility, as needed, from options to bring in other Institute facilitators and/or graduate students – *with the group's approval* – to provide additional perspectives and to accomplish some of the work associated with maintaining group communications (email list, etc.) and related administrative tasks

Recommendation #2. The committee recommend creating an initial six-month agreement for facilitator services beginning with a more intense start-up period, all to be followed by quarterly renewals. We agreed on the desirability of a flexible arrangement with the Institute with respect to facilitation and timeline, which need to be worked out in specific terms for a contract. We Agreement details will be forged in a way that is consistent with UH and HCDA procedures. Rationale:

- The Matsunaga Institute works with public posted hourly rates for various services, including facilitation, support services, and use of students to complete the more clerical and administrative support services.
- The facilitators recommend a more intensive start-up so that an initial assessment survey can be completed and analyzed, for use as an information base for the facilitators to work with the advisory group. Results of the survey are disseminated to the group.
- The group can confirm the plan of work for Phase 2 with the benefit of the facilitation. This, in turn, will determine the time frame needed for Phase 2 consultation.

Possible Phase 2 Deliverables and Time Frame. The following general ideas have been discussed by the Committee and were discussed with the potential facilitators. These were summarized in an email from Nancy Hedlund to Karen Cross.

- a) Phase II Workplan – purposes of Phase II are to:
1. Continue the process of forming the advisory group
 2. Ensure the advisory group shares an understanding of Kaka‘ako makai background and history
 3. Develop “deliverables” for Phase II which include recommendations for HCDA on a shared vision for Kaka`ako Makai; guiding principles to guide planning and decision making; and next steps, including what should be accomplished in Phase III
- b) Possible **Phase II** "deliverables:" for the facilitator agreement:
- Facilitated meetings (including special meetings)
 - Meeting summaries
 - Approved bylaws
 - First vision statement
 - Guiding principles
 - Develop a plan and an RFP for Phase III for consultation to develop waterfront vision and waterfront concept master plan
- c) Possible timeline for Phase 2 for first 6-8 months

May - Facilitator and Bylaws committees meet. Agenda for Facilitator Committee:

1. Review: preliminary timeline, facilitator specifications, job description, facilitator bios
2. Review selection process; nominate candidates for interviews in early June

June - First 2 weeks - Facilitator committee interviews facilitator candidates and makes recommendation at June 25 meeting if possible

June 25 – Advisory Group Meeting –

Bylaws and Facilitator committee presentations and decision making as is possible.
Decide on work plan for summer months before facilitator agreement completed.

July - ? Meetings - If needed to confirm plans and proposal to HCDA for facilitation and to complete work on bylaws. Plan August meetings?

August - ? Meetings - ? Plan meetings on Kaka‘ako History & Opportunities

Presentations on previous plans, history and environmental issues, Hawaiian Sense of Place, constraints, effects of current state and city planning activities on Kaka’ako makai, Waterfront planning groups (e.g. The Waterfront Center, others?), etc.

September - January - Meetings - Work plan to proceed according to plans and develop recommendations and RFP for Phase 3.

d) Possible terms of agreement between UH and HCDA

Facilitator Activity and Approximate Hours	Estimate of Hours	Estimate of Total
One-time activity: Initial assessment by survey to each individual in the advisory group	12 hours – 1 time only	12 hours @200 1 time -- \$2,400
Monthly		Monthly:
1. Facilitation of 2 meetings per month	2 people x 3 hours x 2 meetings = 12 hrs	12 @200 \$2400
2. Generate meeting summary notes and help plan future agendas ? Supported by a group member's notes and group finalizes meeting summaries	2 hours x 2 meetings	4 hours @200 \$800
3. Provide guidance to group leaders or steering team as needed for agendas, communication with external groups and HCDA	3-4 hours/ month	4 hours @200 \$800
Estimated subtotal per month		\$4000
4. Student assigned to project @ \$40/ hour 1 - Maintain email list 2 - Generate and disseminate meeting notices, documents, etc 3 - Maintain communication with chairman and liaison with HCDA as group defines 4 - Arrange meeting locations, working with HCDA on arrangements	10-12 hours / month	10-12 hours/ month x \$ 40 = \$500
Total monthly projected costs		approx \$4,500
Estimate for 10 months of work		\$2400 + 45,000 \$47,400

6. Response from Karen Cross Re Draft Facilitation Plans

From Dr. Karen Cross: That was such an interesting discussion Tuesday evening and we were all impressed with the group, their questions, and interest in getting it right for this very significant project. When Kem [Lowry] and I looked at your plan these things caught our eye:

#1 – The deliverables seem quite realistic as to what was defined as possible **Phase II** "deliverables:"

#2 – We talked at the meeting about doing a pre-assessment. There is no time built in for assessment (individual interviews or pre-facilitation survey). Face-to-face interviews would be 30 min to 1 hr./person. I also use a time efficient method of putting out a survey out for individuals in the group to answer and then collect that and pull common themes and differences out to highlight in the group process. This latter method is dependent on how thoroughly people write their answers and it may not give as comprehensive a picture as the interviews. The survey for a group of your size would take about 10 hours of time for us to collate and draw themes out.

#3 - The proposed educational background sessions should be something the facilitators attend and may be better to have once the group gets started. We had sessions like that when we did [worked with] Lyon Arboretum. We ended up interspersing the informational sessions into the meeting, so there was 1/2 of group work and 1/2 educational with some kind of analysis about what they heard in the educational section.

#4 – The general timing sounds like it would work with our academic year. Here is an outline of some of the early work that a group like the advisory committee would need to go through together. Setting up to work together would include:

1. Group's Goals and Objectives Do we have the group's purpose clearly put forward? Are we clear on what the group will work on? What do you collectively hope to accomplish?
2. Task Force Members' Roles Are members representing themselves or groups? Can alternates represent them?
3. Behavioral Values Are the ground rules sufficient? Do these encourage active listening, civil communication, confidentiality, etc..? Adopt changes as needed
4. Operating procedures for meetings How will agendas be developed? Where are the meetings going to be held, how often and how long? How will the team record its work?
5. Decision Method Will the group use consensus in decision-making (if so what kind?) Or some other type of decision rule?
6. Handling Media

7. Biographical Summaries on the Three Facilitators Interviewed

Karen Cross is Program Manager for the University of Hawai'i Program on Conflict Resolution and Matsunaga Institute for Peace. She manages the academic, research, and service work of the multidisciplinary Peace Institute and the Program on Conflict Resolution, which has a Graduate Certificate in Conflict Resolution and an undergraduate Peace Studies Certificate and major, along with the University of Hawaii Alternative Dispute Resolution Program, which provides conflict prevention, management and resolution services to the university community.. She provides culturally appropriate process design, facilitation, mediation, and a range of conflict resolution training to organizations throughout the state. She often works with schools, university groups, government agencies and the non-profit sector over time to build governance, problem-solving and facilitative capacity. She serves on the boards of the Association for Conflict Resolution Hawaii, the Center for Global Nonviolence, and Consultants for Global Partnership. She co-created "Facilitating in Pacific Ways," a regionally responsive training for facilitators in preparation for the 2004 and 2005 United Nations University Global Seminar held with the University of Hawai'i.

Kem Lowry: PCR's current Director and Professor of Urban and Regional Planning. He is involved in the mediation of public policy issues in Hawaii. He has also served as a consultant to several state agencies, the United Nations, Asia Foundation, the Office of Technology Assessment, the Agency for International Development and is the author of published research on evaluation, dispute resolution and natural resource management. He is a mediator and a member of the Board of Advisors of the Center for Alternative Dispute Resolution, Hawaii State Judiciary and the Board of Mediation Center of the Pacific.

Marina A. Piscalish, Ph.D., Principal Partner of MAPPING Change, LLC. is an experienced Management Assistance Provider, specializing in mediation, facilitation and training in both the public, private and not-for-profit sectors. Her unique expertise combines knowledge of organizational planning and development, dispute resolution and leadership development to create a climate for collaboration in organizations, support visioning and change processes and address organizational conflict. She earned her doctorate in Educational Administration and Policy from the University of Pittsburgh in 1997 and focused her studies on organizational theory and conflict studies. Prior to her move to Hawaii in 1998, Dr. Piscalish founded and directed the Office of Conflict Resolution in Education and later, the Conflict Resolution Program at the University of Delaware. She served as a policy scientist in the Institute for Public Administration at the University of Delaware and now serves as a member of the policy committee for the University of Hawaii's Program on Conflict Resolution. She co-authored a book for Jossey Bass Publishing (2000) titled *Reaching for Higher Ground: Tools for Powerful Groups and Communities*.