JUPITER PRIME
Consulting • Training • Advisory
جوبيتر برايم للاستشارات والتدريب

COURSE BROCHURE

Advanced Enterprise Performance Measurement Architecture Training Course

31 May – 11 June 2027
New York

Advanced Enterprise Performance Measurement Architecture Training Course

Ref: 2766_105823 **Date:** 31 May – 11 June 2027 **Location:** New York **Fees:** 14000 GBP

Enterprise Performance Measurement Architecture is a 2-week advanced training course for performance analysts and planning managers who design how an organisation defines, collects, governs and reviews its measures, and who leave with a finished Measurement Architecture Blueprint. As organisations add systems, units and reporting lines, measures multiply faster than anyone can reconcile them, and leaders lose trust in the numbers that steer them. Jupiter Prime Training builds this course around the structure beneath the scorecard rather than the scorecard itself.

Why Enterprise Performance Measurement Architecture Matters Now

Three forces shape enterprise performance measurement architecture today. Data platforms now let every unit publish its own figures, so competing definitions of the same measure appear in different reports. Boards and funding bodies expect evidence that traces from a headline figure back to its source records. Planning cycles are shortening, so measures must be revised without breaking the history that trend analysis depends on. An organisation that structures its measures well argues about decisions; one that does not argues about whose number is right. The course rests on established practice in strategy mapping, measure definition, data stewardship and performance review design, described in plain terms.

Who Gains Most from Enterprise Performance Measurement Architecture

- Specialists who own the corporate measure catalogue and its definitions
- Planners who translate strategic objectives into targets for units
- Analysts who build the reports and dashboards leaders read
- Data stewards responsible for the source systems behind key figures
- Coordinators who run quarterly and annual performance reviews

A strategy office that sends its planning, analysis and data stewardship staff together gains most, because they leave sharing one map of every measure and its owner.

Enterprise Performance Measurement Architecture Capabilities

Participants move from managing lists of indicators to designing the layered structure that keeps measures consistent, traceable and fit for revision, using cases from hospital networks and utility operators.

- Design a measure hierarchy linking enterprise objectives to unit and process measures — executive committee
- Specify measure definition records with formula, source, owner and reporting frequency — data stewards
- Assess data lineage and quality risks behind headline figures — internal audit
- Calibrate targets and tolerance bands using baselines and capacity limits — unit heads
- Build a review calendar that ties measures to decision forums — strategy office

- Test the architecture against change requests and retired measures — planning managers

Key Enterprise Performance Measurement Architecture Terms

- Measure hierarchy — the layered structure connecting enterprise objectives to unit, process and activity measures through explicit parent and child links.
- Measure definition record — a controlled entry stating a measure's purpose, formula, data source, owner, frequency and interpretation rules.
- Data lineage — the traceable path a figure follows from source transaction through transformation to the report where it appears.
- Tolerance band — the range around a target within which performance is treated as on track without escalation.
- Leading measure — an indicator that signals likely future results, allowing corrective action before outcome figures move.
- Measure retirement — the controlled removal of a measure, preserving its history and redirecting its users to a replacement.

Enterprise Performance Measurement Architecture Day by Day

Day 1: The Measurement Landscape

- Measure Inventory Audit — How Many Figures Compete for Attention
- Duplicate Definition Mapping — Where Reports Disagree on the Same Measure
- Stakeholder Information Needs Matrix — Who Decides With Which Figures
- Measurement Maturity Diagnostic — Current Strengths and Structural Gaps
- Architecture Scope Statement — Boundaries of the Redesign Effort

Day 2: Objectives and Causal Logic

- Strategy Map Construction — Cause and Effect Between Enterprise Objectives
- Outcome and Driver Separation — Which Results Depend on Which Activities
- Value Chain Decomposition — Linking Objectives to Core Processes
- Causal Hypothesis Statements — Assumptions Each Link Must Prove
- Objective Ownership Assignment — Accountability at the Enterprise Level

Day 3: Building the Measure Hierarchy

- Parent and Child Measure Links — Roll-Up Logic Across Organisational Levels
- Leading and Lagging Pairing — Early Warning Alongside Outcome Figures
- Aggregation Rules — Sums, Averages and Weighted Indices Compared
- Shared Measure Allocation — Contribution Where Several Units Influence Results
- Hierarchy Depth Limits — Avoiding Measures Nobody Reads

Day 4: Measure Definition Records

- Definition Record Template — Mandatory Fields for Every Controlled Measure
- Formula and Unit Specification — Removing Ambiguity From Calculations
- Interpretation Rules — Direction, Polarity and Seasonal Adjustment
- Measure Naming Conventions — Searchable and Unambiguous Catalogue Entries
- Definition Approval Workflow — Who Signs Off a New Measure

Day 5: Data Sources and Lineage

- Source System Mapping — Where Each Figure Originates
- Lineage Diagrams — Transformations Between Transaction and Report
- Data Quality Dimensions — Completeness, Timeliness, Accuracy and Consistency
- Stewardship Roles — Custody of Source Data Behind Key Figures
- Manual Workaround Register — Spreadsheets That Carry Hidden Risk

Day 6: Targets and Tolerances

- Baseline Establishment — Reliable Starting Points Before Target Setting
- Capacity-Based Targeting — Ambition Matched to Resources
- Tolerance Band Design — Thresholds That Trigger Escalation
- Target Cascading Logic — Unit Targets That Sum to Enterprise Commitments
- Gaming Risk Review — Behaviours Targets May Unintentionally Reward

Day 7: Reporting Layers and Visual Design

- Audience-Specific Report Tiers — Board, Executive and Operational Views
- Exception-Based Reporting — Attention on Measures Outside Tolerance
- Trend and Variance Visuals — Charts That Support Judgement
- Commentary Standards — Narrative That Explains Movement in Figures
- Report Rationalisation — Retiring Packs That Duplicate Others

Day 8: Review Forums and Decision Rights

- Review Calendar Design — Monthly, Quarterly and Annual Decision Cycles
- Forum Terms of Reference — Which Measures Each Meeting Owns
- Action Tracking Logs — From Discussion to Accountable Follow-Up
- Root Cause Inquiry Protocols — Structured Questions for Underperformance
- Decision Rights Matrix — Who May Change Targets Mid-Cycle

Day 9: Change Control and Measure Lifecycle

- Measure Change Requests — Assessing Impact Before Altering Definitions
- Version Control for Definitions — Preserving Comparable History
- Measure Retirement Procedure — Removing Figures Without Losing Trend Data
- Architecture Health Indicators — Signals the Structure Itself Needs Repair
- Periodic Architecture Audit — Annual Check on Coverage and Relevance

Day 10: Practising the Measurement Architecture Blueprint

- Hierarchy Walkthrough — Testing Roll-Up Logic on a Live Case
- Definition Record Peer Review — Challenging Formulas and Sources
- Review Calendar Simulation — Running a Quarterly Decision Forum
- Change Request Exercise — Handling a Redefined Measure Under Pressure
- Measurement Architecture Blueprint — Final Structure, Owners and Rollout Sequence

Applying Enterprise Performance Measurement Architecture After the Course

- Lead a duplicate definition mapping exercise across the three most-read management reports and agree one definition record per contested measure.
- Run a lineage review on five headline figures with their data stewards and log every manual workaround found.

Enterprise Performance Measurement Architecture Questions FAQ

What is enterprise performance measurement architecture and why does it matter now?

Enterprise performance measurement architecture is the structured design of how measures are defined, linked, sourced, reviewed and changed. It matters now because data platforms multiply competing figures, and leaders need one traceable set of numbers they can trust when decisions carry real consequences.

Which roles gain most from enterprise performance measurement architecture?

Performance analysts, planning managers, data stewards and review coordinators gain most. These roles own measure definitions, targets and reports, so a shared architecture lets them resolve disagreements about figures and spend review time on decisions rather than reconciliation.

How does enterprise performance measurement architecture differ from a course on indicator selection?

Enterprise performance measurement architecture works beneath individual indicators. A course on choosing indicators asks which measures to track; this course designs the hierarchy, definition records, lineage, review forums and change control that keep every measure consistent across the organisation over time.

What do you bring back from enterprise performance measurement architecture training?

You bring back a structured design for your organisation's measures, tested during the course on a realistic case. It sets out the measure hierarchy, definition records, data owners, review calendar and the sequence for introducing the new structure across units.

Enterprise Performance Measurement Architecture: The Way Forward

The Measurement Architecture Blueprint first informs which contested measures receive a single controlled definition. Strategy office staff, data stewards and review chairs use it to align reports and meetings around one structure. After its first quarterly cycle, the perspective worth revisiting is target calibration: whether tolerance bands triggered the right conversations, or simply generated more exceptions than leaders could act on.