

Dear PRISM Partners,

Some time ago a PRISM Partner received a high incidence of suspended service records due to unknown CIP (Classification of Instructional Programs) code errors. This occurred because the partner was using a combination of 1990 and 2000 CIP codes. PRISM's CIP table contains only the 1990 codes.

It was suggested by one of the partners that the two code releases be combined into one table. This was not feasible because we attempted to utilize two tables and created a view, but the result were duplicate codes with differing descriptions. The issue became which code/description from which table received preference.

Before any changes are made to the system, we invite your input. There are several possible directions that can occur. These following four recommendations have been considered by the System Administrators. The System Administrators welcome any other suggestions or additional recommendations for action.

Recommendation 1: Keep the PRISM.CIP90 table as it is now.

Result -- Nothing will change within PRISM database however, the partners submitting CIP codes will continue to receive service record suspensions which affect the posted PRISM report totals.

Recommendation 2: Repopulate the PRISM.CIP90 table with the CIP2000 codes.

Result -- Similar to recommendation 1, adopting this recommendation could create a high incidence of suspended service records for CIP codes sent that are not in the CIP 2000 list which will affect posted PRISM report totals

Recommendation 3: Drop the validation check for all CIP codes being sent to PRISM.

Result -- This would not change any data formats. Using this solution will not change the PRISM.CIP90 table, but it will allow any service record with or without valid CIP codes into the system. The PRISM.SERVICES table key will need to be modified to remove the cip\_code and all partners will be required to use the services\_seq\_id as the duplicate record tie breaker.

Recommendation 4: Records are sent with all 0's in the cip\_code field if the code is not in the PRISM.CIP90 table.

Result -- This would not change any data formats nor change the PRISM.CIP90 table.

The PRISM System Administrators recommend dropping the validation check for the CIP codes and allow flow through of CIP data submitted (Recommendation 3). Currently two partner agencies send these codes and no reports are produced based on CIP codes nor would any be of any value since there is no continuity in the current coding system. The System Administrators believe this approach to be the least invasive since it will not change the PRISM CIP90 table nor will it alter the submission data file formats.

Separating the cip\_code from the key is the issue. Currently, the cip\_code field is used by a partner as a tie breaker for duplicate records sent. This is the purpose of the service\_seq\_id field. If the service\_seq\_id were used as the tie breaker, the cip\_code could be removed from the key. PRISM record processing could be altered to change the service\_seq\_id to 002 (or to whatever would be needed) on all duplicate records.

If this solution is acceptable, a decision needs to be made by the partners submitting CIP codes as to how to treat the duplicate service records currently in the system. There are 36 records that use the cip\_code as the tie breaker. PRISM System Administrators will work with the partner as to the best way to resolve this issue.

Please send us your thoughts by November 15, 2006. If we do not hear from you, Recommendation 3 will be put in place by February 1, 2006.

Thank you,

Chuck Oswald and Becky Rogers  
PRISM System Administrators