On the Qualitative Rankings as listed:

Strategic Plan with Pillars: This is an over arching item and shouldn't be ranked.
Mission (RUSO + OSHRE): Not our concern. These are mandates that should either be in the Strategic Plan, or are external factors that we will need to accommodate as directives become apparent. 
*Workforce Needs should be combined with Stakeholders/Job Market for ranking. 
*SSCI should be combined with Accreditation and NCAA Reports as these are all basically measuring the effectiveness of different areas.
*Student Satisfaction should be more fully defined. What sort of satisfaction are we measuring and how? It might be for jobs or the marketplace, and that part should be measured in the category above.
Legislature (OCPA, etc.): Not our concern. These are mandates that should either be in the Strategic Plan, or are external factors that we will need to accommodate as directives become apparent. The most likely thing to come from the legislature is a funding change and again, we can't rank what we can't control.
*Disciplinary Focus (e.g. Centers of Excellence): This needs to be ranked separately
So there are only four remaining starred items for ranking.

On the Quantitative Rankings as listed:

*Credit Hour Production is just a better way a measuring Enrollment, so these should be combined. There was a lot of discussion about measuring this in a cost efficiency way.
*Pain Index and Summer Revenue Sharing are both way to look at credit hour production and resources relative to one another. This could be combined with Classroom Capacity and Utilization, but with online classes growing, it might not be a good measure of anything. A significant number of people on the committee don't understand the Summer Revenue Sharing Model. However, there was general agreement that we need to look not only at credit hour production, but at the cost of providing those classes. There really needs to be an analysis that looks at how much revenue a class brings in versus the cost of instruction at the section level. For example, an adjunct class covers costs at a very low level, but a full professor needs more students to cover costs. Different departments have different cost structures, and this is all reflected in an efficiency measure. In fact, this category should be named Efficiency.
*Persistence and Graduation needs to be ranked by area, but we need to be aware that a large number of our students are transfer students.
SSCI and Accreditation need to be combined, but these are ranked on both lists, and there was some discussion that we were double counting them.
*Tuition and Fees should be combined with Competitor Rates as we need to be sensitive to what others around us are charging as this is clearly impacting enrollment. We are not the low cost option any longer and need to know where students are going. All expenses need to be looked at as students are charged for many things beyond tuition.
So there are only four remaining starred items for ranking.
There was some general discussion that we need to also look at operating efficiencies in areas beyond academics. For example, are we doing the best we can in providing various other services, including those that cost the students fees, but also those that are contained in overhead? This may require a different measure.
Group 2 Summary (December 10, 2019, Meeting)

There are too many buckets (too many documents, we need to reduce to themes), - I think an effort to just have 3 or 4.

What do we have and can we afford it? looking at our bottom line.

Add value for faculty and staff contributions, Beyond Teaching i.e, maybe more incentives to be a club adviser, ways to incentivize engaging the university outside the classroom.