

Strategic Measurements & Performance Assessment
Committee Meeting
September 16, 2004
8 – 9:30
MSR 130

Attending: Denise Barr, June Boffman, Amin Elmallah, Louisa Herrera, Kelvin Jasek-Rysdahl, Gary Lowe, Maithreyi Manoharan, Priscilla Peters, Julie Reynoso, and Ted Wendt,

Absent: Juan Flores, Peter Li

1. The Strategic Planning Assessment Process Map was summarized by J. Boffman. It represents the measurement review and feedback process for the strategic planning committees and university divisions.
2. Meeting Schedule, the committee meetings will be held Tuesday, 9 – 11 am on the 2nd and 4th week of the month. The next meeting will be next week, September 21, 9 – 11.
3. PB View/Logic Model, application and implications. K. Jasek-Rysdah and G. Lowe presented benefits and drawbacks of using PB View to record and disseminate strategic measures in the logic model
 - Specific measurement and target numbers are needed for the system to properly reflect progress on objectives.
 - A default rate is needed, a general rate is recommended but it is possible to individualize it for specific measures.
 - Primary and secondary indicators can be aligned to allow the secondary measures to feed into the primary measures.
 - If this is done, it is possible to drill down to possible problem areas if the primary indicator target is not achieved.
 - Different objectives can be weighted or divided equally.
 - G. Lowe provided a summary of Logic Model Questions he developed while trying to input the model into PB View.
 - G. Lowe has begun to realign the Logic Model with the 04 – 05 Goals and Priorities.
 - Multiple data measures like the Advising Survey need to be represented by one figure if possible
 - T. Wendt indicated that we could select one representative question or use all rated advising questions to obtain an index number that can be compared year to year.
 - A. Elmallah recommended that all surveys have a summary question that can be used as the critical question that is used for measurement.
 - Role of the committee in gathering and disseminating measurement data was discussed.

- A. Elmallah stated that USGPC is the committee responsible for establishing targets, members agreed.
- A. Elmallah further indicated it was the committee's responsibility to identify how to measure goals, but not to gather the data. Units needed to be responsible for measurement reporting.
- T. Wendt indicated the committee needs to find a way to gather and report the outcomes, we can not just send it back to the units.
- K. Jasek-Rysdah stated that the logic model is way too complicated to work with if it is not entered into a reporting program like PB View. Information that is not numerically based will need to be reported in a different format.
- D. Barr shared that creating an index number is helpful and can be used in benchmarking.
- A. Elmallah recommended asking the units to summarize progress in a simple way, a few sentences for each area.
- Members of the committee were asked to review the questions raised about data in the logic model for discussion at the next meeting.

Respectfully,
June Boffman