

PRISM and Common Measures

April 3, 2007

Present: John Glen, Lily Sehon, Aaron Hughes, April McGuire, Gus Johnson, Al Pierce, Greg White, Dave Allen, Graham Slater

Absent: Karen Hummelbaugh, Ray Worden, Evelyn Roth, Jeanette Fish

Introduction

Graham shared three handouts:

1. Summary table from the OWIB Performance and System Improvement Committee.
2. Proposed meeting outline with Greg's specific comments.
3. Proposed meeting outline.

At the end of our 2/6/07 meeting ...

“What we’re really talking about is a new system that would be in place by 2009, with some IMIS recommendations incorporated (e.g. common identifier), would meet all WISPR and Common Measures requirements, and would be a customized query tool.”

That is, *New PRISM* should have the following characteristics:

- Data warehouse that includes data from all seven DOL WISPR programs and other Oregon workforce partner programs.
- Uses common identifier.
- Meets all requirements of WISPR reporting.
- Produces and submits federal common measures.
- Produces a limited number of other standard, systemwide measures.
- Includes a query tool to allow workforce partners to obtain data on varied measures of their choosing.
- Allows non DOL agencies (e.g. OVRs) to get performance data that's relevant and useful for them.
- Contains elements of flexibility for future expansion, especially remaining open for connectivity with new education data management development.

Continuing discussion ...

Is there still consensus that ideally – setting aside cost, resource, and other concerns – this would be the best approach?

Discussion:

- There is also another work group, focusing on implementation of IMIS. We can't afford to develop two parallel systems. Jeanette Fish is co-leading that group, and several people are on both groups.
- As previously discussed, there's a need to coordinate major projects on IMIS, PRISM, WISPR, Trade Act.
- OED IT has prepared a white paper on IMIS. Recommendation was that we might need a project manager eventually, but initially, they would use the current TAA special project to work through early details.
 - A Data Mart (Troy Rutten's concept) would hold all data from state and local 1b, Wagner-Peyser, TAA, UI wage records, etc.
 - PRISM would be a reporting product using those data ...
 - The Data Mart would produce and send all federal data and reports.
 - Discussion of the importance of developing a system that reflects Oregon's needs and priorities, not just the federal requirements.
- This other group, with OED's IT staff, are several steps ahead of our group in terms of designing a new data system. We should probably merge and use their existing thinking.
- But some of the above goals would not be accomplished from the large Data Mart; they will come from a revamp of PRISM itself.
- In this view, PRISM is seen as a niche component of a broader system; not as the broad system itself.
- WISPR implementation has been delayed for a year, until July 1, 2008. Even then, a final integrating report system would not be required at that time.
- Concern from DHS: they use PRISM for reports at the state level, not for federal reporting.
- When DOL talks about an exit from the system, does that include TANF? In Oregon, TANF is a mandatory partner under WIA; it isn't mandatory at the federal level. We would want to include it in Oregon, but we may have to include data reflecting exits from the DOL programs and exits from the entire system.
- Is it best to have all workforce-related programs in the Data Mart? Or should some, e.g. TANF, continue to have separate systems to run federally required reports? DHS can provide data either to a data mart or data warehouse, but will need to retain responsibility to run its own federal reports in-house and not through this other system. What's best for the Oregon system?
- Discussion of the Florida system – some feel it's the way we should go; it includes all education and workforce data; it's basically cobbled together; it's working; and it's not resource-intensive. Florida has this system housed in a university, so the educational entities can freely share, without concern about FERPA.
- Definitions:
 - Data warehouse – all data is dumped into one place.

- Data mart – all data are live ... constantly changing. This could also serve as a data / case management system; data constantly updated and current.
- Concern that under the model proposed by the other workgroup, the main Data Mart is titled DOL Programs. What about other programs, like OVRS (DOE)?
- Continuing discussion of balance between responsibilities for federal requirements and desire to build systems to meet state needs.

Graham's suggestion: some key people from this PRISM/Common Measures group should become part of the IMIS/broader group. We cannot redesign PRISM in a vacuum from those things. We would want to add John, Lily, Aaron, and Greg to these discussions.

ACTION: Graham ... talk to Dave (OED lead on IMIS), Jeanette (TAA / WISPR lead), and Troy ... we need to consolidate this whole set of work, so we don't have duplicate efforts going on.

Initial Charge of Our Work Group

... make a recommendation to WPC regarding PRISM and Common Measures.

Recommendation:

1. **Our future workforce performance system should not just be focused on DOL programs; it should be broad enough to include all Oregon workforce and education programs.**
2. **We should maintain the current PRISM measures until a complete data system rewrite is possible. We should not use resources to change or tweak the current PRISM measures until a fully new system is released.**
3. **As part of that eventual fully new system, we should:**
 - a. **Modify the current placement and retention measures to match the common measures.**
 - b. **Introduce the common measures definition of average wage.**
 - c. **Keep a measure of wage gain (for TANF request).**
 - d. **Produce all the above measures based on system exit and on individual program exit.**
 - e. **Keep other TANF-specific measures as they currently are.**