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Arizona State University Criteria Checklist for

SOCIAL AND BEHAVIORAL SCIENCES [SB]

Rationale and Objectives

The importance of the social and behavioral sciences is evident in both the increasing number of scientific inquiries into human behavior and the amount of attention paid to those inquiries. In both private and public sectors people rely on social scientific findings to assess the social consequences of large-scale economic, technological, scientific, and cultural changes.

Social scientists' observations about human behavior and their unique perspectives on human events make an important contribution to civic dialogue. Today, those insights are particularly crucial due to the growing economic and political interdependence among nations.

Courses proposed for General Studies designation in the Social and Behavioral Sciences area must demonstrate emphases on: (1) social scientific theories and principles, (2) the methods used to acquire knowledge about cultural or social events and processes, and (3) the impact of social scientific understanding on the world.
### ASU--[SB] CRITERIA

A SOCIAL AND BEHAVIORAL SCIENCE [SB] course should meet all of the following criteria. If not, a rationale for exclusion should be provided.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
<th>Identify Documentation Submitted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>![ ]</td>
<td>Syllabus, table of contents of books</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>![ ]</td>
<td>![ ]</td>
<td>Economics; History, Cultural Geography</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>![ ]</td>
<td>![ ]</td>
<td>Syllabus, table of contents of books</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>![ ]</td>
<td>![ ]</td>
<td>Syllabus, table of contents of books</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**THE FOLLOWING TYPES OF COURSES ARE EXCLUDED FROM THE [SB] AREA EVEN THOUGH THEY MIGHT GIVE SOME CONSIDERATION TO SOCIAL AND BEHAVIORAL SCIENCE CONCERNS:**

- Courses with primarily fine arts, humanities, literary, or philosophical content.
- Courses with primarily natural or physical science content.
- Courses with predominantly applied orientation for professional skills or training purposes.
- Courses emphasizing primarily oral, quantitative, or written skills.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria (from checksheet)</th>
<th>How course meets spirit (contextualize specific examples in next column)</th>
<th>Please provide detailed evidence of how course meets criteria (i.e., where in syllabus)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1                         | To understand human interaction within critical human events, this course uses Information Measurement Theory (IMT) as a structure to identify/analyze humans and why they act the way they do in relationship to their ability to perceive information. It examines interaction of people in business, personal, and social environments. Using IMT, it examines other social behavior theories and major events to help students understand why people behave in certain ways and how to predict what people will do. | Syllabus Highlights:  
- pg 1 Program Goals  
- pg 2 Course Description  
- pg 2 Learning Objectives  
- pg 5 Schedule: Units 1,2,3, 4, 5, 9  
- pg 2 Information Measurement Theory (Text book): table of contents  
- pg 2 The Prince and Other Writings (book by Niccolo Machiavelli) table of contents  
- pg 2 Mind is the Master (complete James Allen Treasury books) table of contents |
| 2 & 3b                    | Student homework and class assignments (research papers, news articles, etc.) are focused on having them look at a subject, event, social behavior ideas, or experts, and analyze their perspective, behavior, or idea in comparison and relationship with IMT. In this way we have the students focus on current, historical, and cultural human behaviors. The students are given the ability to choose the direction of their social behavior study and given the opportunity to present and discuss in class. | Syllabus Highlights:  
- pg 1 Catalog Description  
- pg 2 Learning Objectives  
- pg 2 Textbooks  
- pg 5 Schedule: Units 3,5,6, 8,9,10  
- pg 2 Information Measurement Theory  
- pg 2 The Prince and Other Writings  
- pg 2 Mind of the Master |
| 4                         | This course uses deductive logic and dominant information to accurately observe the reality of social and behavioral perspectives like human health [genome and epigenome, | Syllabus Highlights:  
- pg 1 Program Goals  
- pg 2 course description  
- pg 2 learning objectives  
- pg 2 textbook  
- pg 5 schedule: Units 2, 6,8 |
| veganism] and environmental problems like family dynamics. |
CON294/HON394 Deductive Logic, Leadership & Management Techniques

Arizona State University | Del E. Webb School of Construction
Course Syllabus

COURSE INFORMATION
Semester: Fall 2013
Time/Location: Monday & Wednesday (1:30pm - 2:45pm) | USE 125
Section: 82204 / 80832
Website: Blackboard (https://myasu.courses.asu.edu)
Website: KSMleadership.com

INSTRUCTOR INFORMATION
Instructor: Dean Kashwagi
Office: USE 250
Phone: 480-965-4273
Email: dean.kashwagi@asu.edu
Office Hours: Email to schedule an appointment.

TA: Jacob Kashwagi
Email: jacob.kashwagi@asu.edu
Office Hours: Email to schedule an appointment.

TA: Alfredo Rivera
Email: AlfredoRivera@asu.edu
Office Hours: Email to schedule an appointment.

Dr. Dean is the Director of the Performance Based Studies Research Group (PBSRG) and a Professor at the Del E. Webb School of Construction. Dean is considered a leading expert and researcher in performance/information based systems, best value procurement, measurements of information, and supply chain management. Dean has performed research on over 1,000 procurements valued at over $1.5 Billion. He is a seasoned presenter with over 400 presentations, and an accomplished author with 14 books, 23 journals, and over 100 conference publications. Prior to joining ASU, Dean spent 14 years in the US Air Force as a Design Engineer. He has won awards for innovations from CoreNet Global, PMI, IFMA, and Pono, and was also honored as a Fulbright Scholar. Dean is currently a registered Professional Engineer in nine States.

OVERALL PROGRAM GOALS
Construction management professionals combine knowledge of innovative technologies, construction principles and business management to lead a wide variety of construction projects from residential and commercial buildings to infrastructure projects. The DEWSC program goals are to teach students how to become responsible leaders in the construction industry through organization, leadership, and current/innovative management techniques.

The American Council for Construction Education (ACCE) states that it is essential that every Constructor be capable of effectively managing personnel, materials, equipment, costs, and time. The Constructor must be able to effectively communicate and understand their role as a member of a multi-disciplinary team, the assessment of project risk, and the alternate methods that can be used to structure the owner-designer-constructo team.
COURSE DESCRIPTION
This course provides an overview of Information Measurement Theory and its application in various contexts. The aim is to understand how and why humans interact in the ways they do depending on their environment. Using IMT along with other perspectives and research as guiding frameworks, we explore issues affecting our lives and work in various industries. Through discussion, debate, and written assignments, students will learn to communicate this information in a dominant manner that follows the IMT logic. The course material will come from history’s visionaries, including Socrates, Einstein, and Denning.

This will teach students a structure in which they can “know everything without knowing any technical information.” As a result, students will be able to investigate ways to analyze reality and problems occurring in every industry, and find the simple and logical solutions that can be applied to everyday work. IMT is a foundation of many leading-edge technologies that have been developed at ASU and tested worldwide in construction and non-construction related services.

LEARNING OBJECTIVES
Students will be able to
- Differentiate between relying on observation and the blind acceptance of norms
- Implement the identification of reality and how to predict it
- Execute the act of simplifying rather than complicating
- Focus on the whole picture rather than the details
- Classify and understand individuals
- Identify the control everyone has over their own life
- Identify and utilize dominant information
- Distinguish the differences of accountability and influence

TEXTBOOKS AND REFERENCE MATERIAL
Required:

Suggested:
- Allen, J. (2008), As a man thinketh, New York, NY: JMWW Group. (Free online)

GRADING POLICY
The following criteria, weights, and grading scale will be used to calculate the Final Grade (the Instructor may modify/adjust as necessary):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Weight</th>
<th>Honors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Midterm Test</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honors Paper 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnographic Interview Paper</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Report and Presentation</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Grading Scale
- A = 90% to 100%
- B = 80% to 89%
- C = 70% to 79%
- D = 60% to 69%
- E = 0% to 59%
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Homework and Quizzes</th>
<th>15%</th>
<th>15%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attendance and Participation</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Only required for HON 304 students*

COURSE POLICIES, PROCEDURES, AND REQUIREMENTS

Classroom Procedures – Please turn off your cell phones prior to attending class. Cell phone usage in class is not allowed (this includes texting). Food or drinks cannot be brought into the classroom. The use of recording devices is not permitted. Using your computer to take notes during class is acceptable. However, please do not use your computer to surf the web, respond to email, or for any activity not related to the classroom activities during class time.

Attendance and Participation – Class attendance is mandatory. Absence from class may result in the loss of participation points. Much of the learning that occurs during this course happens in the classroom. If you are absent, for whatever reason, you lose the benefit of sharing of knowledge by the faculty and other students.

Make-Up Policy – Prior notice will be given to the instructor when a class will be missed. It is the student’s responsibility to obtain notes, supplemental material, and assignments from fellow classmates. Only under the most extreme circumstances, supported by written documentation, will a make-up exam be given. The final decision rests with the instructor.

Quizzes – Quizzes may be given throughout the semester and may not necessarily be announced in advance. Missed quizzes cannot be made up. Sharing calculators or plans is not permitted. Quizzes are closed book, closed notes, closed neighbor.

Assignments – Read the assignments, do the problems, and seek assistance if you need it. Assignments must be turned in at the beginning of class on the due date specified. Late homework will be penalized for each day late with a deduction from the grade.

Professional Work – To receive credit for your work, it is imperative the work be organized, readable, and professional (part of your grade will be based on presentation of your work). Assignments must be done on a word processor. All assignments must be written with a logical flow of thought. Proper spelling and grammar is required.

Extra Credit - Extra credit should not be expected in this course. However, extra credit will be considered should the professor see a reasonable need for it.

Honors Credit – Make note that this is both an undergraduate class as well as an honors class. Because of this, there will be some slight differences in what is expected from the students although the actual material being taught will be the same...
UNIVERSITY POLICIES

Academic Integrity - All students in this class are subject to ASU’s Academic Integrity Policy (http://provost.asu.edu/academicintegrity) and shall acquaint themselves with its content and requirements, including a strict prohibition against plagiarism. By registration in this class, you are assumed to have read, understand and agreed to this policy. All violations will be reported to the Dean’s office, who maintains records of all offenses.

Student Code of Conduct - The Student Code of Conduct sets forth the standards of conduct expected of students who choose to join the university community. Students who violate these standards will be subject to disciplinary sanctions (http://students.asu.edu/srr/code).

Classroom Behavior - Any violent or threatening conduct by an ASU student in this class will be reported to the ASU Police Department and the Office of the Dean of Students. The use of recording devices is not permitted during class (unless permitted by the Instructor).

Religious Observances - Accommodations will be made for religious observances provided that students notify the instructor at the beginning of the semester concerning those dates. Alternative arrangements will generally be made for any examinations and other graded in-class work affected by such absences.

University Sanctioned Activities - Students who expect to miss class due to officially university-sanctioned activities should inform the instructor early in the semester. Alternative arrangements will generally be made for any examinations and other graded in-class work affected by such absences.

Disability Accommodations - Suitable accommodations will be made for students having disabilities and students should notify the instructor as early as possible if they will require same. Such students must be registered with the Disability Resource Center and provide documentation to that effect.

Academic Calendar - The academic calendar (https://students.asu.edu/academic-calendar) contains important dates that students should be aware of, including: the first and last day of class, drop/add deadlines, withdrawal deadlines, and observed holidays.

Copyright Protection - All contents of these lectures, including written materials distributed to the class, are under copyright protection. Notes based on these materials may not be sold or commercialized without the express permission of the instructor.

Syllabus Changes - Any information in this syllabus may be subject to change with reasonable advance notice,
# Detailed Class Schedule

Class sessions will be in accordance with the attached schedule. The instructor reserves the right to modify and/or adjust the schedule.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Subject Matter</th>
<th>Readings &amp; Assignments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Unit 1:</strong> Monday: August 26th  &lt;br&gt; Wednesday: August 28th</td>
<td>Information Measurement Theory  &lt;br&gt;- Syllabus Overview  &lt;br&gt;- Introduction to IMT  &lt;br&gt;- IMT Lecture  &lt;br&gt;- Discussion Activity</td>
<td>IMT Book: Ch. 1 &amp; 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Unit 2:</strong> Monday: September 9th  &lt;br&gt; Wednesday: September 11th</td>
<td>Kashiwagi Solution Model  &lt;br&gt;- IMT Review  &lt;br&gt;- KSM Dilemma Test  &lt;br&gt;- Forks Over Knives</td>
<td>IMT Book: Ch. 3 &amp; 4  &lt;br&gt;9/4/13: Homework 1: KSM Book Chapter Assignment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Unit 3:</strong> Monday: September 16th  &lt;br&gt; Wednesday: September 18th</td>
<td>Information Measurement Theory  &lt;br&gt;- One Minute Presentations  &lt;br&gt;- Influence – No Influence</td>
<td>9/11/13: Homework 2: Article or Web Assignment  &lt;br&gt;9/17/13: Paper #1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Unit 4:</strong> Monday: September 23rd  &lt;br&gt; Wednesday: September 25th</td>
<td>Kashiwagi Solution Model  &lt;br&gt;- Kashiwagi Life Example</td>
<td>9/18/13: Homework 3: Article or Web Assignment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Unit 5:</strong> Monday: September 23rd  &lt;br&gt; Wednesday: September 25th</td>
<td>Who Is On My Molecule  &lt;br&gt;- W/O/MM Lecture Part 1 &amp; 2  &lt;br&gt;- Activity (Airplane Crashes)</td>
<td>IMT Book: Ch. 7 &amp; 8  &lt;br&gt;9/25/13: Homework 4: Article or Web Assignment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comment [AR19]:** Syllabus Highlight for Criteria 1: IMT is a social behavior theory, that helps to predict how people will behave based on the amount of information that they can perceive. Overview of the theory based upon the family dynamics of the Professor for over 20 years. Explains how human events are not random and could be explained by observation and use of deductive logic.

**Comment [AR18]:** Syllabus Highlight for Criteria 1: Follows the above comments statements of introduction into IMT.

**Comment [AR20]:** Syllabus Highlight for Criteria 4: Teach students the KSM mechanism to identify dominant elements of individual characteristics in order to classify data and human interaction quickly and accurately. Explains why people do what they do and how to quickly identify a person's behavior based on using extremes.

**Comment [AR21]:** Syllabus Highlight for Criteria 4: Shows students different social perspectives of health-related topics and how different data collection methods actually relate to the who the person is, and which data method relates most with them.

**Comment [AR22]:** Syllabus Highlight for Criteria 1: Teaches students how to observe the most simple attributes in their life and share who they believe they are.

**Comment [AR23]:** Syllabus Highlight for Criteria 2  & 3: Students are required to remain current in the news and discuss how they see the various theories of social behavior in operation.

**Comment [AR24]:** Syllabus Highlight for Criteria 2  & 3: Students will observe and research the economics and political climate in the world and use IMT to clearly explain what we could learn from it.

**Comment [AR25]:** Syllabus Highlight for Criteria 1: The Professor shows through his human interactions how he was able to come up with the theory and drew from the smartest minds in history to put it in perspective.

**Comment [AR26]:** Syllabus Highlight for Criteria 1: Syllabus Highlight for Criteria 2 & 3: This promotes students to look in their environment and start observing what is transpiring and to become empowered they are in control of their environment by changing themselves.
| Unit 6: | Leadership and Alignment  
- Incentives Debate  
- Leadership Lecture | IMT Book: Ch. 6 & 10  
10/2/13: Homework 5: Leadership  
Book Chapter Assignment  
10/7/13: Paper #2 |
|---|---|---|
| Monday: September 30th  
Wednesday: October 2nd  
Monday: October 7th | | |
| | | |
| Unit 7: | Review  
- Midterm | 10/9/13: Homework 6: Article or Web Assignment |
| Wednesday: October 9th | | |
| | | |
| Unit 8: | Dominant Information  
- Dominant Information Lecture  
- Genetics  
- Inside Job  
- Inside Job Discussion | IMT Book: Ch. 5  
10/16/13: Homework 7: Dominant Information Book Chapter Assignment  
10/23/13: Homework 8: Article or Web Assignment |
| Wednesday: October 16th  
Monday: October 21st  
Wednesday: October 23rd  
Monday: October 28th | | |
| | | |
| Unit 9: | Industry Structure & PIPS  
- Discussion Activity  
- Industry Structure Lecture  
- PIPS Lecture | IMT Book: Ch. 12-14  
10/30/13: Homework 9: IS or PIPS Book Chapter Assignment  
11/6/13: Homework 10: Article or Web Assignment |
| Wednesday: October 30th  
Monday: November 4th  
Wednesday: November 6th | | |
| | | |
| Unit 10: | Application  
- A Few Good Men Activity  
- Frost Nixon Activity | 11/13/13: Homework 11: Article or Web Assignment  
11/18/13: Final Project |
| Wednesday: November 13th  
Monday: November 18th | | |
| | | |
| Unit 11: | Student Presentations | 11/20/13: Homework 12: Article or Web Assignment  
11/27/13: Homework 13: Article or Web Assignment |
| Wednesday: November 20th  
Monday: November 25th  
Wednesday: November 27th | | |
| | | |
| Unit 12: | Review  
- Discussion Activity  
- Review | | |
| Monday: December 2nd  
Wednesday: December 4th | | |
| | | |
| Unit 13: TBA | Final | |
Deductive Logic Assignments

All Final Product Instructions
1. The final product should be professional.
2. The value of the assignment should be dominant. Meaning the grader should not have to make a decision on what grade to give the assignment.
3. Students should try to spend less time and create more value when doing their assignments.
4. The final product should only contain the dominant information.
5. The student should make sure all of their references are documented.
6. All assignments need to be e-mailed to assignments@pbsrg.com with the assignment and TA's name listed in the subject.

All PPT and Paper Formats
1. For an example visit http://ksmleadership.com/online-piracy/
2. PowerPoint
   a. Title: Topic
   b. Beginning: Summary of issue
   c. Middle: Dominant Information [metrics, stats, charts, etc.]
   d. End: Slide by slide References.
3. Written Document
   a. Title: Topic
   b. Beginning: Summary of issue/topic
   c. Middle: Question and Answers; Dominant Information
   d. End: References [listed out as to which site/reference provides what information.]

Profile Assignment
The student will complete a short biography including dominant information about their lives. The objective of this assignment is for students to start critically thinking about their interactions with others and how IMT principles help in the analysis. Assignment will be submitted through the KSM Leadership website or through a bio-sheet in the assignments folder on blackboard.

News Article PowerPoint
Students will locate a news article and analyze it. Using Information Measurement Theory (IMT) concepts, derived from weekly Modules, students will write up Dominant PowerPoint slides. The PowerPoint slides should contain what can be learned from the article and IMT, a solution for the problem, and/or what it exemplifies. This is an opportunity to analyze various social and behavioral interactions in the current events. What are the insights you can perceive by observing people's reality. The article should be cited in or attached in the slides.
Students should follow the online format to complete this assignment at KSMleadership.com. *This assignment can also be done on a current event.*

**KSM Leadership Discussion**

Students will go to the KSM Leadership website at ksmleadership.com and comment on 3 items on the website. Items can include the blog, news articles, top issues and others comments. This is important for each student to read and try to understand what information is being presented. In what context is the person speaking, and how does understanding who they are help you quickly predict human behavior and social engagements. A screenshot must be sent of all 3 to assignments@pbsrg.com within the same e-mail.

**Movie Analysis**

Students will be asked to watch and analyze a movie designated by their instructor. This activity is designed to challenge students to always have the mind in motion, actively thinking and trying to understand important messages that are being presented. Activity Sheets will be provided and the analysis must include IMT concepts and how the IMT lessons can be applied to life.

**IMT Reading Assignment**

Students must read assigned chapters in the Information Measurement Theory book. The book serves as the structure to identify/analyze humans and why they act the way they do in relationship to their ability to perceive information. Students should also answer the questions below after the reading the corresponding chapters. Place in Word Document and submit to assignments@pbsrg.com.

1. Kashiwagi Solution Model Chapter Assignment
   a. After reading the chapters on KSM, students should use the information to answer the following.
      i. **KSM is based off the idea that everything is relative and related; using at least 3 characteristics about yourself, find out 4 more using KSM principles. Describe the process you used and anything new you have learned about yourself.**

2. Leadership Chapter Assignment
   a. After reading the chapters on Leadership and Alignment, students should use the information to answer the following.
      i. **In the book a new model of leadership is described. Using past experience identify two group leaders that you have dealt with, one that exemplifies the new model and one that exemplifies the old model. Compare them and explain which leader you thought brought more productivity and success to the group and why.**

3. Dominant Information Chapter Assignment
a. After reading the chapters on Dominant Information and Decision Making, students should use the information to answer the following.
   i. In the business industry, decision making is sought after as a useful trait. What are your thoughts about decision making and why do you think it is seen this way? Why does the book list decision making as a Type C trait?

4. Industry Structure Chapter Assignment
   a. After reading the chapters on Industry Structure and PIPS, students should use the information to answer the following.
   i. The information collected on Industry Structure and PIPS were collected from the construction and procurement industry but it has characteristics that can be applied almost anywhere. Using what you know, describe how the Industry Structure and PIPS could be used in your industry of interest, and what problems it could solve.

**IMT Topic Research**

Instructor will give a topic to students (genetics, business, Olympics etc.), and each student will find an article, book or publication on the topic that displays dominant information, and analyze what they have found and how it may impact the social and behavioral perspectives about these topics. Write it up using Dominant Information.

**IMT Examples**

Students will gain further enrichment of the application of IMT from examples of IMT in life. Students will learn to identify and utilize dominant information when applying IMT, while using logic and observation. The importance of these examples is for students to start learning how to utilize the KSM mechanism, which utilizes dominant extremes to quickly identify individual’s characteristics. Using one of the possible IMT Example Power Points, explain how the topic relates to IMT. At the end of each PowerPoint discuss the example and identify the lessons learned. Create document using PowerPoint. Use Dominant Information.

**Papers**

The papers serve as the core social and behavior research conducted by students. Students should comprehensively or individually collect data, by using IMT, to examine interactions of people in business, personal, and social environments. Students must examine the social behavioral theories of IMT and analyze subjects that are related to human events, social behavior ideas, various perspectives and ideas. There are 3 total papers in the course. Students will have multiple options regarding how they want to complete these papers. Students should work with their TA on establishing a topic and direction for each paper. All papers should provide value and should be based off a topic that the student is interested in, or would like to know more about. All 3 papers can be combined into one topic or separated into 3 separate topics. *Final Project of Paper 3 should be a dominant presentation, which each student will have the opportunity to post their work on KSMleadership.com and present during finals. Below are possible topics:
1. Controversial topics.
3. Perspectives and Ideas.
5. Dominant Genetic Information.
6. Ethnographic Interview.
8. Identification of others.
2013 Information Measurement Theory (IMT)

Dean T. Kashiwagi, Ph.D.
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Foreword

In 1992, at age 40, I left the United States Air Force with a $20K cut in pay, with eight kids, a wife, and $10K in my pocket, to pursue my dream.

My vision was “How to implement a structure/system where my understanding of what I didn’t know, would be my strength.” Develop a system where, “the less I knew, the better off I was, and what I could observe would still allow me to know more than anyone else”, and where “by using my powers of observation, I could minimize risk as if I knew everything.”

I felt like the technology, which came to be known as the Performance Information Measurement System (PIPS) and the Performance Information Risk Management System (PIRMS), had a great potential.

I knew the Information Measurement Theory (IMT) was flawless. I had observed and developed IMT over the last 20 years of my life with assistance from my wife and family. I knew the deductive logic approach of recognizing and aligning concepts of simplicity and common sense would overcome the results of all the traditional practices of the “blind” who did the same thing over and over, hoping for a different solution. I realized the validity of finding out what everyone else knew (inductive), and then shaping tomorrow’s concepts on the same concepts would bring the same problems. The blind were leading the blind, and that would never lead to any change.

How would I convince anyone to try such an “out of the box” idea? The beginning days were rough. I would never have survived, if I did not have a visionary leader, Bill Badger, whose only rule was “there are no rules.” The only ones who could truly help me was the group that helped develop IMT, my wife and kids. With a small office that could not even fit my own desk, and my wife bringing the younger kids playing on a blanket in the only open space in the office, while she was sending out 100 faxes to research clients with an angry line of professors behind her, we started the Performance Based Studies Research Group (PBSRG.) My compliments to my wife, who became my first research assistant.

The resistance to our research has never ended. I have had the National Science Foundation (NSF) tell me that I wasn’t a researcher, that the ideas where ridiculous, asking who in their right mind would work with us, and if the idea was so good, why didn’t everyone else jump aboard? I have had my own peers denigrate the work and identify it as not important.

But thank goodness for the visionaries! Dave Cotts, Bill Badger, Thom Tisthammer, Gordon Matsuoka, Charley Serikawa, Steven Miwa, Rich Byfield, Mike Steele, Ron Campbell, Michael Perkins, Nathan Chong, Jeff Meyer, Patrick Okamura, Kenneth Sullivan, Herman Koebergen, Mark Little, Tyrone Brooks, Ray Jensen, John Riley, Adrian Sannier, Wim Bakens, Sicco Santema, Jeff Meyer, Stephanie Witt, John Morrison, Steve Hagar, and Scott Schlotthauer, Jeroen van de Rijt,
Wiebe Wittenveen, Carlita Vis and others..... My peer review was not my fellow professors, it was the folks who actually had to put out money, and deliver on time, with less resources, and providing better value.

Fifteen years later, approaching $10.5M in research funding, delivering $4.5B in services, and having the largest organizations in the world adopting the visionary PIPS/PIRMS concepts, I can honestly say that the “dream is alive”, we have conquered the world of the “blind.” We have shown how to minimize transactions up to 90%, increase profits up to 100%, and deliver value/performance 98% of the time. We have done it all over the United States, and now common sense is seeping into Europe, Africa, and the Pacific Rim.

And today we have a new generation! John Savicky, Kenneth Sullivan, and Jacob Kashiwagi. The young guns who have staked their lives on the logic and common sense of PIPS/PIRMS, IMT, and have become the new generation “Dr. Deans.” They will see this technology go to the ends of the world.

Where are we today? We are on the cusp of creating and applying a leadership based organization structure. We are on the verge of helping “blind people see” without changing their behavior. We are helping add value by creating a new seamless environment where vendors manage and control their own work, and always think in the best interest of the client. The performance information/measurement environment will revolutionize the world. In simplicity we have now explained complexity.

For all those who have helped, who have put the interests of humanity ahead of their own, who have helped in the cause, my hat’s off to you....welcome to the most amazing journey of simplicity which will unravel the issues of the world. Enjoy the experience. We invite you to come to our annual conference and become part of the visionaries.

Dean Kashiwagi
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Foreword

This is the companion manual for the Information Measurement Theory manual. This manual covers PIPS/PIRMS in detail, and gives the case studies to document that:

1. Best value leads to lower prices, more qualified vendors, efficiency, and customer satisfaction.
2. It has been done over and over for 15 years.
3. It has now gone into Europe and Africa and the Pacific Rim.

I have found that common sense and logic have no language. The downside of such a technology is that the majority of the people in our society, industries, and academic setting are "blind." They continue to proliferate the status quo: "we need experts to tell the people who are doing the work how to do it, when to do it, and where to do it."

PIPS/PIRMS is a structure that does not depend on people knowing what to do. It aligns resources with the minimum amount of human decision making. As in the previous manual, best value should:

1. Minimize the need to manage.
2. Minimize the need to direct and control.
3. Minimize the need to communicate.
4. Minimize transactions.
5. Minimize cost.
7. Maximize technical competency.
8. Maximize customer satisfaction.
10. Allow the "blind to see, and the nonperforming to know what performance is."
11. Create transparency and accountability.
12. Transform a non-transparent environment to a transparent environment, without depending on people's decision making, expertise, and experience.

Remember, common sense needs no precedence, or statistical analysis.

Good luck and enjoy PIPS/PIRMS. If you are currently testing, you will become a part of the manual in the future. Come join us at our annual education conference, and become a visionary.

Dean Kashiwagi
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