Minutes



Performance Measures Review Working Group meeting #5

Date: 15 August 2012 Time: 10:00 am – 3:30 pm Place: CASA

In attendance:

Name Ann Baran Peter Darbyshire Robyn Jacobsen Carolyn Kolebaba Crystal Parrell Celeste Dempster

With regrets:

Name Cindy Christopher David Lawlor Ruth Yanor

Stakeholder group

Southern Alberta Group for the Environment Graymont Inc. CASA Alberta Association of Municipal District & Counties Alberta Environment and Sustainable Resource Development CASA

Stakeholder group Imperial Oil ENMAX Mewassin Community Council

Peter Darbyshire chaired the meeting which began at 10:02am. Quorum was achieved.

Action Items:

Action items	Who	Due
3.1: Once a rough draft of the Strategy is prepared, Celeste	Celeste	When Strategy is
will add a list of acronyms to the document.		complete.
4.1: Celeste will begin adding definitions to the terms in	Celeste	Ongoing. Will be sent
the glossary.		out prior to the next
		meeting with the draft
		strategy.
5.1: Celeste will add information on the following	Celeste	By next meeting.
concepts from the Balanced Scorecard to the Performance		
Measurement Strategy:		
Wording and creating objectives		
• Adding a column for 'target' and 'initiatives' to		
the Objectives and Measures/Indicators Straw Dog		
5.2: Celeste will consult with CASA's Financial	Celeste	By next meeting.
Administrator about a performance measure relating to		
audits.		

5.3: Celeste will consult CASA's Strategic Plan to clarify the objective under Goal 4 "Provide a forum for information-sharing".	Celeste	By next meeting.
5.4: Celeste will update the Objectives and Measures/Indicators Straw Dog with the changes discussed.	Celeste	By next meeting
5.5: Celeste will conduct consultations with project team co-chairs with respect to the draft Guidelines for Project Teams on Performance Measurement.	Celeste	September 2012.
5.6: Celeste will poll for dates for the next meeting in October.	Celeste	ASAP

1) Administrative Items

Participants were introduced and welcomed to the meeting.

The agenda and meeting objectives were approved by consensus.

The minutes from meeting #4 were approved by consensus with amendments to Section 2 (additional details on the CASA update required) and Section 3 (editorial change: added word 'indicator' to the 2009 review new and revised indicators for clarity).

The action items from meeting #4 can be updated as follows:

Action items	Who	Due
3.1: Once a rough draft of the Strategy is prepared, Celeste will add a list of acronyms to the document.	Celeste	When Strategy is complete.
3.4: Celeste and Robyn will research the Balanced Scorecard in greater depth and explore if it is possible to integrate the two methodologies and what might be the benefit of doing so.	Celeste and Robyn	Done. On today's agenda.
4.1: Celeste will begin adding definitions to the terms in the glossary.	Celeste	Ongoing. Will be sent out prior to the next meeting with the draft strategy.
4.2: Celeste will update the written strategy with the discussed changes.	Celeste	Done. Will be sent out prior to the next meeting with the draft strategy.
4.3: Celeste will update the objectives in the Straw Dog and send to the Group for review.	Celeste	Done.
4.4: After Action Item 4.3 is complete, the Group will individually brainstorm measures/indicators for each objective and send to Celeste.	All	Done.
4.5: Celeste will compile the measures/indicators that the Group brainstorms for each objective in the Straw Dog for consideration at meeting 5.	Celeste	Done.
4.6: Celeste will poll for dates for the next meeting for the end of July/middle of August.	Celeste	Done.

2) CASA Update

Celeste gave an update on current CASA activities:

- The next Board meeting will be held on September 27th.
- The CASA and AAC Joint Standing Committee contracted consultants to write a discussion paper to form a basis for future discussions around policies and strategies affecting airshed zones as well as roles, interests and relationships between the AAC, airshed zones and CASA. They will present the discussion paper to the Board at the September meeting.
- The Coordination Workshop newsletter, presentations and photos are available on the CASA website and Flickr/Slideshare accounts. Summary and feedback documents are being compiled. A briefing will be provided at the September Board meeting.
- The CFO project team has reached an agreement to disband and will present at the September Board meeting.
- The Electricity Project Team will be ramping up in fall for the 2013 Electricity Framework 5year review.
- The Secretariat has been preparing a draft Statement of Opportunity for Odour that will be brought forward to the CASA Board for discussion in September. The Statement will continue to be reviewed and refined prior to the Board meeting.

3) Action Item 3.4: Balanced Scorecard

At meeting #3, Celeste gave a presentation on possible methodologies that the PMRWG could use in the Performance Measurement Strategy. Two methodologies were discussed: the Logic Model and the Balanced Scorecard. The Group decided to move forward with the Logic Model methodology and developed a Logic Model diagram and associated Straw Dog Objectives and Measures/Indicators table. The Group decided that more information on the Balanced Scorecard was required if any of the concepts from this methodology were to be integrated into the Performance Measurement Strategy.

Celeste gave a powerpoint presentation to provide background on the Balanced Scorecard and the Group discussed if there were any concepts from the Balanced Scorecard that would be useful to integrate into CASA's performance measurement system.

The Balanced Scorecard was developed by Robert Kaplan and David Norton in the early 1990s in an effort to move corporate performance measurement away from exclusive reliance on financial measures. The Balanced Scorecard calls for measurement in four areas or 'perspectives':

- Financial
- Customer
- Internal processes
- Learning and growth

Since that time, non-profits and government agencies have begun to modify the Balanced Scorecard in order to apply it to their own organizations. A component of this shift has been to bring the customer perspective to the top of the list rather than the financial perspective.

There are some similarities between the Logic Model and the Balanced Scorecard. Both the Logic Model and the Balanced Scorecard advocate using performance measurement to help translate strategy into action. Performance measurement is a powerful communication, monitoring and management tool. Both methodologies use a one-page graphical representation of how an organization works. The Logic Model calls this one-pager a logic model while the Balanced Scorecard calls it a strategy map. Both use the terminology and format of objective and measure. The Balanced Scorecard outlines some clear guidelines to help develop objectives. An objective should be a concise statement that describes what an organization needs to do well in order to be successful; it should begin with an action verb. The Balanced Scorecard, however, does not use the term performance indicator as does the Logic Model. In its formatting, the Balanced Scorecard includes targets and initiatives in the same table as objectives and measures (this is called the scorecard). Initiatives are the specific programs, activities, projects or actions an organization undertakes in order to meet its' targets. Targets are also used for performance measures in the Logic Model (but not performance indicators). In the Balanced Scorecard, targets and measures are highly quantitative while the Logic Model advocates for a balanced of quantitative and qualitative measures. The Balanced Scorecard uses the idea of 'cascading'. Cascading is the process of developing aligned strategy maps and scorecards throughout an organization. Each level of the organization will develop maps and scorecards based on the objectives and measures from the group to whom they report.¹ The Group discussed applying this concept to CASA's performance measurement system but agreed that it wasn't a good fit.

Action Item 5.1: Celeste will add information on the following concepts from the Balanced Scorecard to the Performance Measurement Strategy:

- Wording and creating objectives
- Adding a column for 'target' and 'initiatives' to the Objectives and Measures/Indicators Straw Dog

4) Action Item 4.5: Objectives and Measures/Indicators

At meeting #4, the Group reviewed the Objectives and Measures/Indicators Straw Dog. Between that meeting and today's meeting (meeting #5) Celeste updated the objectives in the straw Dog and the Group brainstormed specific measures/indicators to accompany each objective. These ideas were compiled, along with input from the Secretariat, to create the current version of the Straw Dog. The Group reviewed the objectives and measures/indicators in detail.

Action Item 5.2: Celeste will consult with CASA's Finance Officer about a performance measure relating to audits.

Action Item 5.3: Celeste will consult CASA's Strategic Plan to clarify the objective under Goal 4 "Provide a forum for information-sharing".

Action Item 5.4: Celeste will update the Objectives and Measures/Indicators Straw Dog with the changes discussed.

¹ Information on the Balanced Scorecard was taken from the book *Balanced Scorecard step-by-step for Government* and *Nonprofit Agencies*, 2nd edition by Paul R. Niven.

5) Consultation with Project Teams

The Group reviewed the draft Guidelines for Project Teams on Performance Measurement. The Group agreed that it is important to provide Project Teams with guidelines to help them with performance measurement while giving them the space to craft creative measures that meet their needs. The idea of SMART measures and recommendations was well received. SMART measures can be qualitative or quantitative. The Group made the following changes to the draft:

- Provide examples of SMART and non-SMART performance measures and recommendations
- Project teams can also refer to the Performance Measurement Strategy and framework for guidance.
- Add extra explanations about Managing Collaborative Process (MCP) Step 4.
- Project teams should meet with the Performance Measures Committee after their Project Charter has been approved.
- The word 'obligation' will be changed to 'requirement'.

The Secretariat will also discuss adding the Guidelines to the MCP guide as an Appendix.

The Group discussed consulting with project teams and determined that project teams would be most interested in the Guidelines. The Group agreed that sharing the guidelines would produce the most useful information. The Group decided to focus consultations with project team co-chairs and that the details of the consultations would be determined and conducted by Celeste. The Group will then review the feedback and determine how to incorporate it into the Strategy.

Action Item 5.5: Celeste will conduct consultations with project team co-chairs with respect to the draft Guidelines for Project Teams on Performance Measurement.

6) September 27th Board Meeting (Calgary)

The Group discussed what information to share with the Board at the September meeting. The Group decided that there will be a presentation only, with no written attachments provided. The presentation will help to introduce the Board to new concepts in advance of bringing the Performance Measurement Strategy to the Board. The presentation will provide an overview of the review process, the steps that the PMRWG has taken so far, introduce some new concepts and outline the next steps that the Group is taking. The Group decided to focus the Board on new developments in the world of performance measurement that the group explored. The presentation will introduce the ideas of the new definitions of performance measure and performance indicator as well as the Logic Model.

The Performance Measures Review has been allotted 40 minutes on the agenda with about 20 minutes for the presentation and about 20 minutes for questions. David and Peter volunteered to co-present.

7) Next Steps

Action Item 5.6: Celeste will poll for dates for the next meeting in October.

The meeting adjourned at 3:20pm.