

**Compass Advisory Team Minutes
 Wisconsin Rapids, D4 Office
 January 7, 2003**

Team members present: Joe Hollister, Tom Walther, Mike Ostrenga, Jerry Kast, Mike Burns, Brett Wallace, Bruce Fredrickson, Scott Schnacky, Alison Lebwohl, John Kinar

Guests: Dave Veith, Tom Beekman, Gary Brunner, Teresa Adams, Tim Nachreiner, Anne Reis

Unable to attend: Jack Yates, Gary Kennedy, Matt Rauch, Anne Monks, Mark Wolfgram, Brian Gaber

Topic	Discussion	Tasks & owners
New members	New members were introduced: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bruce Fredrickson will replace Joe Hollister after Joe's retirement. • Brett Wallace will provide a D1 and an area supervisor perspective. 	
Presentation and Discussion of Data in Charts and Reports	<p>Charts:</p> <p><i>Average/Vertical Charts</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Include activity costs (RMA and DMA) on charts. Have x, y, and z axes with z as % of budget (cost data) for that activity/feature. Add line with cost data on bar graph • Show grade bands and statewide average and/or target levels. • Highlight significant differences between counties/districts. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Keep current format. <p><i>Profile/Horizontal Charts</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Include the % of A, B, etc. (grades) segments in bars and # of occurrences in bars. • Show every county within a district and the features within one element on one chart. • Provide an explanatory title for the charts. • Label Best to Worst or vice versa for scores. • Show county feature profile data. • Show all 22 features just for one district. • Start at lowest level of detail and work up (feature to element) • Disclaimer for charts: Current year's data should not be used for decision making. Because it is the first year there is an incomplete picture. There is not a full complement of elements. <p>Text:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide background about raw data: the process, who, when, why, goal of compass, overview of data set, sample size, # of segments per county, what is compass, how the report fits into the project time line, how did we get to this point, what's next. • Explain grading system, derivation of weights. • Explain scoring system and why some data is not reported. • Explain the scoring system as it relates to the amount of work/cost input. • Delineate the features that comprise the individual elements. • Explain atypical grades in counties or districts. • Feature data more helpful for maintenance program decisions. 	<p>Alison and Anne will create charts as described in discussion, with modifications as dictated by available time and statistical findings.</p> <p>Alison and Anne will draft the report as described in discussion here and under "other points" and "report & message."</p> <p>Advisory Team will comment on the report, with a draft being issued to them on Friday, 1/24 and comments returned by Tuesday 1/28.</p>

<p>Other points about the data</p>	<p>What affects the data:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rater discrepancies. • Stratifying by road class; group is not concerned for this year's data. • Geography. • Currently no targets; will provide in future. • No cost data; will provide in future. • Weighting of scores: weights and calculations can be redone if the prove to be a problem <p>Inter-rater reliability:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • QA is being used in a few counties to test the viability of the ratings process, but this won't give us county-to-county comparisons. • We are working on this for the future. • Rater questionnaires are also a source of information about inter-rater reliability. <p>Rolling up the data:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Should we continue to roll up things into elements? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Currently, will keep element reporting <p>Target Levels:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How do we develop targets? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Do we need the same target level for every feature-general consensus yes currently ○ How much does it cost to reach these target levels? <p>Bucketing the Grades</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What does a score mean for mowing vs. litter? The idea that an 80% is an 80% is an 80%. The score must be consistent among features <p>Score consistency across state</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What does a 100% mean? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Not enough room for good measurements or state is doing well on feature. Should we eliminate these features if high score is a reality, e.g., graffiti? ○ Is it that the standard that was set too low? ○ Do scales need to be redefined? <p>Low Scores</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Low statewide landscaping score <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Confusion on how to rate it, but also counties don't know how to maintain it ○ Lack of maintenance guidelines, awareness, funds, designated responsible party • Low statewide delineator score <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Has to do with delineators on guard rails <p>Revising standards for next year</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Separating instead of grouping for features <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Score for culverts may mean multiple things, e.g., clogged vs. needing repair • Layperson needs to be able to do ratings, if not, don't include measure or feature 	<p>Alison will note points raised to the left and put them in the report text and/or on the agenda for consideration in future meetings. She will also make sure they are considered when data analysis and reporting choices are being made.</p>
<p>Key Messages</p>	<p>Take Home Points: <i>If people put down the report and only remember a few things, what should those be?</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What is Compass? • This is the first shot at statewide participation in the program. • Ask yourself: What decisions can I make with this; what 	

	<p>can I use this information for?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Motivate new decision making; motivate feedback for program improvement • There is consistency in scores across the state. <p>Report Text:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Explain influence of improvement program • Explain that standards and measures are still being tested • Clarify that Compass is not a full program yet. We are providing an incomplete picture. • Current limited ability to use other systems, e.g. SIMS, culverts (Asset management) • Explain basic statistics, random sampling, clarify assumptions. For example, road classes, not considered, but will be considered potentially in the future. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Road classes will be used in Pavement and Winter Elements • Will provide raw data when requested 	
<p>Issuing the Reports</p>	<p>Key Audiences</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Each County Commissioner • County Patrol Supervisors • Area Supervisors • District SPO Chiefs <p>Who needs a presentation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • IDIA • Co. Commissioners • Commissioner Training-heads up at winter meeting • Fall Patrol Supers • Roadbuilders <p>Who needs a heads up:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Secretary's Office-potentially • IDIA • SPO Managers • Advisory Team CC'd • DOT Internal newsletter/bulletin, one paragraph <p>Questionnaire:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Feature feedback-drop/add • Other data, e.g., cost, target • How to establish targets • Where to go next, rank possible choices • What % of budget • What else do stakeholders want to know • How will you use this report • When is the best time of year to do ratings <p>What should be in packet:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hard copy with pivot tables in electronic form <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Counties 2 hard copies ○ Provide counties with their own raw data or provide each district with their counties' raw data ○ All districts want Pivot Tables with data 	<p>Anne will work with BHO staff to create (e)mailing list(s) and mail reports.</p> <p>Alison will create questionnaire.</p> <p>Alison will present data directly, where appropriate.</p>
<p>Topics for Future Discussions</p>	<p>Rating and Rolling Up</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Which features do we continue to rate? Which do we pull out of program, e.g., markings and signs? • Weights, bucketing data, scores, and do we want to continue to use elements. • Segment scoring: Teresa Adams suggested deducting points from a perfect score 	<p>Alison will note points raised and put them on the agenda for consideration in future meetings. She will also make sure they are considered when data</p>

	<p>Cost codes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Group wants cost data associated with feature/element scores (RMA and DMA)• Teresa Adams suggested using scatter plots to look at cost effectiveness, using cost per lane mile and scores and develop a curve for cost vs. scores• Are feature/element scores reflective of current years budget or previous years?• Cost effectiveness different for different features-need time series?• Need rolling average on 3-5 year basis.• How do we tie features to cost data? <p>See also: "Other points..."</p>	<p>analysis and reporting choices are being made.</p>
--	--	---