

## **Annual AASHTO SCoQ Meeting – Portland, Oregon**

### **Subteam Work Sessions**

April 29<sup>th</sup> 8am-12pm

April 30<sup>th</sup> 10:15am – 11:30am & 12:30 – 2:45pm

---

### **April 29<sup>th</sup> 8am-12pm**

Attendees: Ginger, Joyce, Jeff, Rich, Judonne, Sam, Mark Ford, Emilio Martinez, Mark Chandler, Lori Bird, Julie Zirlin

#### Subcommittee Accomplishments

Survey

Video

Funding \$11,400

Website

Monthly Conference Call Attendance

Handbook Outline

Partnering Definition, Mission, Goals – Team agreed to review periodically, but to leave as is until our next annual meeting.

Conference Call – Change to Pacific Standard Time and keep on the 4<sup>th</sup> Friday of the month

Action: Judonne to modify times to pacific standard and update website

Pete Rahn – Suggested that each committee submit Key Components that could be given to CEO's of DOT's interested in implementing quality in their organization.

SCoQ Orientation – Team presented the Video and asked the attendees to fill out a video comment form

### **April 30<sup>th</sup> 10:15am – 11:30am**

#### **New Membership Orientation**

- Strong Leadership
- Workers – We are doers
- National & International Influence
- Website – Judonne keeps us on the straight and narrow (heart and soul)
- We all Play significant roles
- Teleconferences
- Dedicated to quality

#### **Succession Planning**

Past Chair

Chairperson

Chair Elect

## Annual AASHTO SCoQ Meeting – Portland, Oregon

### Subteam Work Sessions

April 29<sup>th</sup> 8am-12pm

April 30<sup>th</sup> 10:15am – 11:30am & 12:30 – 2:45pm

---

Group reached consensus on succession plan – Ginger will remain Chairperson and Jeff will become Chair Elect.

### Communications Subcommittee – Fred Jones

Partnering Subcommittee to provide input to Communications regarding revised brochure due by August 15<sup>th</sup> ; audience: CEO's and Quality Officers

Also find out what we could hand out as Goody Bags: DVD/VHS; Survey, Info on Website, Coming Attractions, Book Cover on outside of bag

#### Actions

- Team to provide input to Communications subcommittee
- Judonne to order brochures (existing and new) from Carmen
- Judonne to speak to Clearinghouse regarding transportation site navigation seems to be an issue (quality.transportation.org) perhaps our sub-domain name could be made easier

### April 30<sup>th</sup> 12:30pm – 2:45pm

Video Survey – initial results

1. View other videos
2. Action Plan for next steps

Mark Ford and Esther Strauder-Payton compiled video survey reports.

Question 1: 54 responded

5 – 3

4 – 28

3 – 21

2 – 2

1 - 0

Question 2: Content:

	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>Other</u>
Interest	46	2	(6)
Explained Partnering	42	8	(4)

Survey Participant Suggestions: More specific examples; more non-construction related; slow beginning (Mary Peters) --- Ginger

Need “How to Examples” of partnering process

#### Actions

- Subteam to work on video – Keep same team, AZ will load changes with New Mexico's assistance
- Possibility of having the video on the web site – Judonne to follow up with the Clearinghouse
- References of other videos available from other DOT's

## **Annual AASHTO SCoQ Meeting – Portland, Oregon**

### **Subteam Work Sessions**

April 29<sup>th</sup> 8am-12pm

April 30<sup>th</sup> 10:15am – 11:30am & 12:30 – 2:45pm

---

#### Video Team Members:

Larry V

Ginger M.

Joe S.

Steve M. - FHWA

Dan D. – ADOT

Craig M. – ADOT

Stephan K. – NM

Col. Gils – FHWA DC

Julie Z.

**Marketing Plan** – base initial steps on Partnering Survey results

#### Actions

1. Marketing Expertise Involved
  - Implementation & Education
  - State Rep & Federal Highway Rep, Comm. Team Liaison
2. Who is our target audience
3. Teleconference call to discuss issues
4. Team Rep – Rich to oversee this process
5. Set parameters for the resource help, timeframes, etc.
6. First conf. Call have a full team involved in talking about the importance
7. What products we will deliver: video, handbook, website, promotional items, etc.

**Handbook** – status, next steps

1. Table of Contents Agreed to
2. Who is the audience
3. Judonne – technical writer, team members in charge of subject matter
  - Bridgid – Section 4 “Are you ready to Partner”
  - Sam –Section 9 “Awards”
4. Possibly have consultant take body of work to create final product
5. Include Case Studies
6. Next ScoQ annual meeting Handbook will be delivered
7. Oct/Nov 2002 Deadline for Handbook

**The Subteam prepared a 10 minute Action Report based on the following criteria:**

1. Pete Rahn’s Challenge – Key Components
2. What will we deliver in the next year?

Jeff presented the Action Plan Report to the large group (see attached)

## **PARTNERING VIDEO COMMENTS**

### **1. What is your overall rating of this video?**

**Why?**

**Low – (0 responses)**

**Below Average – (3 responses)**

- **Message?? Video Production??**
- **Many claims – no results, few facts**
- **Was a conceptual video rather than a “how to”**

**Average – (20 responses)**

- **A tool to enhance relationships where they may be strained Two much talking heads, particularly at the beginning.**
- **Information is anecdotal. Does a good job selling partnering, but there isn’t much substance on how partnering is accomplished.**
- **Focus seems to be constriction partnering, recommend expanding focus to other areas**
- **Did not say what the process was. Just Promo**
- **It focuses on “Concept” of partnering but does not say next step or how it works**
- **Superlative is too general (not supported)**
- **Fewer talking heads would have been better**
- **The initial “how to” slides moved too fast**
- **Captures one’s imagination, need full body language**

**Above Average – (29 responses)**

- **Clean, neat, short, sweet**
- **I like the examples of projects using partnering concepts**
- **Very well done**
- **5 if more of Pete**
- **Very positive and upbeat**
- **Gets messages across very well to those with a little background. Not sure it will communicate to those who don’t already know something.**
- **Great message**
- **Help those states who have not started to partner**
- **Enthusiastic, keeps your interest**
- **I’ve seen many videos**
- **Short and to the point**
- **Gets right to point on what is partnering**
- **Good variety of speakers**
- **Good overview**

- Good comments from a wide variety of people
- Makes the case
- Informative at appropriate level. Moved well
- Gets the message across
- Content good, speakers believable
- Exciting and energetic
- Really good interview clips, well organized, good length
- Good presentation

**High – (3 responses)**

- Step-by-Step how to and good example from credible people that have had outstanding experience in process.
- Uses people who have had experience with partnering divisions.
- Clearly presented what partnering is all about.

**2. Rate the content:**

**Low – (0 responses)**

**Below Average – (4 responses)**

**Average – (16 responses)**

**Above Average – (30 responses)**

**High – (5 responses)**

**a.) Did the video provoke interest in partnering?**

**Yes – (47 responses)**

**No – (4 responses)**

**b.) Did it explain partnering?**

**Yes – (43 responses) No – (10 responses)**

**c.) In your opinion who would be the audience for this video?**

- Resource Agencies – (3 responses)
- MPOs – (3 responses)
- Public/Private Agencies (3 responses)
- State Agencies (3 responses)
- Federal Agencies (5 responses)
- Local Agencies (7 responses)
- FHWA (7 responses)
- Contractors/ Construction (18 responses)
- State DOTs (30 responses)
- Anyone that could use the process
- In a partnering effort, anyone who has not been previously partnered
- Any employee in the transportation community (at all levels)
- Anyone in the transportation field
- General audience
- I have no idea, I would not show to any audience

- Those who know the process.
- Those who want to know who recommend partnering
- Not sure because it is just conceptual ... if there is evidence of reluctance to partner – target them

**d.) What is the likely response of the intended audience (i.e. State DOT employees & others in location where partnering is not the norm)?**

- Raises enough positive aspects regarding partnering
- Should promote interest
- Support for general concept
- Promote interest in partnering
- Some interest, because you show a variety of states and projects
- I think it will provoke interest
- Might generate some interest in partnering
- At least minimum interest in the concept of partnering.
- Will be encouraged to try it
- “I would like more info on the subject” probably
- General Interest, Some skepticism
- Positive
- Positive response to relating new tool
- Positive
- Interest is giving a try out
- “I’ve got to look into this”
- Some interest; desire to get more info
- I think they will be interested and want more information about partnering
- It should create interest
- Create interest
- I believe it could spark interest in pursuing further information
- They would probably start thinking about partnering
- Need for additional examples that apply to them specifically
- Where did professionalism go?
- Not practical
- May or may not convince them
- Not enough detail about “how to” however I believe there is a video that may cover that
- Contractors want to waive specs; DOTs not flexible
- “Interesting Concept” how do you know (performance measure) it works
- More information might be sought out from other states
- How do I do this and where do I find the time
- Hopefully wanting more info to implement partnering
- Tried it an it didn’t change anything, no success
- Nothing new, yea-so

- In order to get states interested to try partnering we need to tell them what to expect i.e. cost-benefit. I'm not sure this [video] covers this issue
- Caution to accept would improve if specific data could be shared. (personal opinion)
- Reluctance from government staff except for construction. Private sector will support it.
- No idea!
- What were you trying to say??
- Unconvincing

**3. Rate the technical quality of the video:**

**a.) Quality of the image?**

- Low –(0 responses)
- Below Average –(7 responses)
- Average – (15 responses)
- Above Average –(26 responses)
- High – (6 responses)

**b.) Quality of sound?**

- Low – 1 too much noise when Mary is talking
- Below Average –(0 responses)
- Average – (15 responses)
- Above Average – (23 responses)
- High – (20 responses)

**c.) Quality of the graphics?**

- Low – (0 responses)
- Below Average – (2 responses)
- Average – (19 responses)
- Above Average – (23 responses)
- High – (7 responses)

**4. What did you like about this video?**

- It's comprehensive content
- Love the examples from people who have used partnering
- Clear message. To the point
- Variety of state, FHWA, contractors
- Pete. Begin, and end with him
- Plenty of high level speakers supporting concept
- The perspective of different public /private stakeholders
- Presentation
- Good variety of speakers, clear message
- Diversity of the testimonials
- Interviews, clarity

- **Use of experiences from several states**
- **Variety of testimonials**
- **Well done, semi-professional video related to transportation industry**
  
- **Music and to the point**
- **Real world examples and real people**
- **Comments by speakers was honest**
- **Fairly fast moving, high level overview**
- **Various short information from “real people”**
- **Testimony from transportation officials**
- **Variety of speakers**
- **People like to see “live projects”**
- **Short-length, contained general info**
- **Used good mixture of vantage point testimonies**
- **It was positive**
- **All of the folks being quoted in camera**
- **Presentation, mix of partner**
- **On site (or job site) shots, instead of: studio” shots**
- **It moved along provided visual examples of the audio**
- **Lot of perspectives from al over the country, including a private perspective**
- **Presented viewpoints of many different organizations on the positive aspects of partnering**
- **Does a great job of selling partnering as a very valuable tool**
- **Geographic diversity of speakers**
- **Presenters showed strong belief in partnering. Good examples**
- **The testimonies**
- **Reviews interest in partnering**
- **Different points of view from various people**
- **Brief and variety of remarks**
- **Discussion of results and benefits**
- **Discussed the steps of partnering**
- **FHWA lead in the New Mexico “I” project segment**
- **Structure from outline to detail explanation**
- **I particularly like the comments from the project managers and contractors**
- **Short, sweet and to the point**
- **Comments of those involved in partnering**

**5. What didn't you like about this video?**

- **Nothing**
- **Can't identify anything specifically**
- **Kansas #1 Spokesperson read his portion obviously**
- **Need more information on the process workshop setting**
- **Only one specific project mentioned**
- **Only the issue of disagreement between contractor and state DOT**

- Caltrans women kept saying “them” even though this was supposed to be a partnership
- Took a couple of minutes to get to a clear example-will some audiences be left behind?
- A little too long (repetitive)
- Need more contractor interviews few more specific projects-customer comments on projects
- Wanted more detail on how the partnering was implemented
- Robert Fisher’s eyes looking around
- Some transition problem in the scenes. First Kansas person reading script
- The one speaker from Kansas looked down like he is reading his script
- Might be a bit long but the variety of speakers helped
- More exploration of objections to partnering and ways to overcome (i.e. it takes time and energy, how to get started)
- Music drowns out Mary’s comments on the opening. Music is too loud
- Reduce the time of ‘talking heads’; more graphics, more live projects, show actual results such as ‘ the big I’ time, money
- For a few of the interviews, the camera was swaying back and forth
- Graphics hard to follow: specifically the aspects of partnering; don’t cap each word and put a bullet before each slide
- Fewer talking heads would have been better
- Too many talking heads (beginning), List should have some other visual backgrounds, could we get a shorter website name?
- I felt that rather than just seeing Ginger talk about the process, use graphics or images that evoke the various steps
- Some segments didn’t flow into next segment. Seemed choppy where this occurred.
- Too many people saying too little
- Needs more information about how successful partnering is achieved
- Needs data (i.e. money, safety, benefits)
- More examples beyond construction, community partnering during environmental and design process, utilities are recommended
- The speeches about partnering and the lots
- Unclear of partnering with whom? Implies partnering is a replacement for professionalism (is professionalism gone?)
- Emphasis seems to be on construction
- The portion on Ginger seem to focus on her hands – maybe redo like Mary Peters
- Somewhat redundant
- Caltrans guy was too “touchy-feely” – it lost me for a minute- our common interest is projects
- Don’t really walk away with an understanding of partnering – how you do it.

- Too structure delivery format the presenters need to be more engaging
- Lighting and shadows – particularly on Ginger and on Pete were very harsh
- It left me hanging ... what do I need to do other than plan a workshop
- Try to be more persuasive distributed

**6. Any Comments or suggestions either for this video or possible additional videos”**

- Possible a follow up contact person
- In future video, coach people on how to act natural in front of the camera
- More (one or two) contractors saying something positive would be better. Do another for contractors
- List states that use partnering on the video or use AMAP to illustrate that info
- Case studies will add more credibility
- Add customer interviews
- Add few more projects
- At the end include info to request handbook
- Post to a website (if cost effective) so web pointer can be emailed
- Adjust members (first person) picture sways back and forth
- Incorporate some specific results, like, disputes/claims are down
- It would be nice to have a video primarily aimed at contractors. Deal with their issues and answer ‘what’s in it for them’
- Ask Ms. Peters to SMILE...it would seem more positive
- How can partnering be used inside a DOT?
- All white folks, it seems to me – Where are the minorities?
- Good length ... not too long
- Redo segment on person looking at notes
- Decide who your audience is, what you want to tell them – keep it to the point. Decide on 3 or 4 themes (ideas) and explain and give examples.
- More information regarding how the partnering process works
- Should focus examples on Environmental and Design processes
- Bring more results up front to grab attention. I like the sound on “Reduce claims and litigation”
- Discussion about how much time it takes to do this
- Add titles or functions to names and associations/department of speakers
- Add a handout summarizing keys points
- Video appear to be a “rah rah” from a lot of people for partnering – not as much what is partnering, how do you do it?
- Perhaps more detail on just what partnering is

- **Coordinate with Team Recognition folks to get input on what to do about partnering using Baldrige as the baseline**
- **Many claims made about the benefits of partnering but no data supporting the statement provided.**



# Partnering Sub-Committee

Action Report  
April 30<sup>th</sup>, 2002

# Action Report Topics

- Key Components – Pete Rahn
- Video Survey Results
- Video Action Plan
- Handbook
- Marketing Plan

# Key Components – Pete Rahn

- Perform self-assessment using the Baldrige criteria – use online survey found on [www.nist.gov](http://www.nist.gov)
- Identify Key Partners and develop those relationships through tools such as: partnering agreements and processes
- Link with Partnering Subcommittee for assistance – visit [www.transportation.org/committee/partnering/index.htm](http://www.transportation.org/committee/partnering/index.htm)

# Video Survey Results

- 54 Responded

Question 1: What is your overall rating?

1= Low 2=Below Average 3=Average  
4=Above Average 5= High

5 responded with a rating of 3  
4 responded with a rating of 28  
3 responded with a rating of 21  
2 responded with a rating of 2  
1 responded with a rating of 0

# Results Continued

- The team will consider all your input

# Video Action Plan

- Sub-team to work on video
- Possibility of having the video on the web site
- References of other videos available from other DOT's

# Handbook

- Partnering Handbook will be delivered during the next AASHTO Standing Committee on Quality Meeting
- Outline Completed and Subject Matter Experts Identified

# Marketing Action Plan

- Marketing Expertise Involved  
Implementation & Education  
State Rep & Federal Highway Rep.  
SCoQ Communication Team Liasion
- Set parameters for the resource help, timeframes, etc.
- What products we will deliver: video, handbook, website, promotional items, etc.

## Annual AASHTO SCoQ Meeting – Portland, Oregon

### SCoQ Core Team Conference De-Brief

May 1<sup>st</sup>, 2002

---

Attendees: SCoQ Chair & Vice Chair, Subcommittee Chairs, Vice Chairs, Next Conference Site Chair

#### General Structure Items

- SCoQ Core Team will teleconference at least quarterly – Fred Jones to set this up
- Each Subcommittee should have a plan for leadership succession
- Funding for participants to travel to SCoQ will not be provided
- Subcommittee leadership will continue to be provided by the DOTs. FHWA people will participate but not hold a committee leadership position (Chair, Vice-Chair)

Next Conference – Draft Structure – Mark (Kentucky) will draft and send to Chairpersons

- Monday – Subcommittee work all day
  - Tuesday – Conference with learning tracks
  - Wednesday – ½ day learning tracks
  - Wednesday – ½ day Core Team De-Brief
- Conference to be held in mid-April in Lexington, KY

#### Topics/Issues

- Pete Rahn gathered ideas for the CEO Checklist for implementing Quality. He will complete it and share with the CEO's
- Pete said that SCoQ is all about the three "P's"
  - Practices
  - Partnering
  - Performance

We should use this to sell SCoQ & Quality

- The group discussed a candidate for SCoQ Chairperson when Pete leaves. The current Oregon DOT CEO is a likely candidate.
- The group discussed a possible ½ day training for CEO's in conjunction with the AASHTO Spring meeting or held earlier since the meeting is really going to be a summer meeting (May) and a group of new CEO's will be incoming in January. The group agreed that a CEO should teach the class.
- Pete challenged the group to think big and broad. Keep the big picture in mind. Focus on what the taxpayers and industry need:
  - Best Practices
  - Partnering Agreements
  - Performance and Results
- Funding is a large issue. Mike Ryan gave a briefing of where funds come from:
  1. State Pools – SP&R
    - States can contribute funds to a pool to create a guide, deliver a conference, etc.
    - State Initiated and lead
    - There is a standard format
  2. 20-7 SCOH Mike Ryan is on this Committee

## Annual AASHTO SCoQ Meeting – Portland, Oregon

### SCoQ Core Team Conference De-Brief

May 1<sup>st</sup>, 2002

---

- Committees apply for funding
- Funding ranges from \$25K to \$100K per request
- There is a “pot” of \$500-600K annually

The Committee meets two times a year at AASHTO and approves Projects

- There is a standard 2 page form to write to submit a request
- A panel reviews and funds accordingly – in October
- Usually a consultant does the work
- Projects are expected to be done in 6-18 months

#### 3. 20-24 Tom Berry of Florida Chairs

- (Mary Peters did chair) They focus on measurements
- \$1 million in funding – Mike doesn't know their timeframe

#### 4. SCoR (Standing Committee on Research) – Dwight Bauer of Idaho Chairs

- FHWA \$30 Million (requests for funding generally equals \$70 Million)
- This group allows other committees to “carve out” chunks of funding, i.e. 20-7 = \$500-\$600K  
Others such as 20-24 equal \$1 Million
- Membership is 16 – 8 CEO's, 8 Researchers

Decision: SCoQ decided to prepare a speaking paper for Mike Ryan to go forward and request that a chunk of money be carved out for SCoQ (\$500,000)

**Action Item for Partnering Subcommittee:** Tom Church will contact Subcommittee Chairs for deliverables on which funds will be spent.

- Relationship between SCoQ and NPHQ
  - NPHQ has been given an ultimatum – get industry on board or cease to exist as it is currently structured
  - NPHQ will become part of SCoQ
  - However, if they are able to secure industry buy-in and participation they will remain separate
  - Industry is nervous about innovative products, processes
- Website – Discussion of how to populate the website

Decision – SCoQ Recognition & Award applications will be posted. The posting will reflect all the participants who submitted applications and if they won an award.

- Proposed language for the Reauthorization Bill will be drafted and presented. The language will encourage funding for States to implement or improve the quality processes.