



Performance Reporting Information System Management Steering Committee

September 25, 2001
Meeting Minutes

Attendees: Terri Johanson (CCWD); David Rike (ODE); Annette Talbott (OEWP); Michael Dougherty, Curt Amo, Kathryn Naugle, Marc Perrett, Rick Luthe, Evelyn Roth, (OED)

Absent: Michael Buckley (DHS), Virlena Crosley (OED)

Presiding: Curt Amo

1. Welcome and Introductions

2. Modifications to meeting Agenda

As there was not yet a quorum of committee members present by 2:15pm, the decision was made to table the draft Administrative Rule discussion and the approval of Minutes until after the Project Update in anticipation that more members would be in attendance at that time.

3. Project Update

At each subsequent Steering Committee meeting there will always be a project update where the following three items will be covered.

Schedule: Kathryn Naugle reported that there have been no changes impacting the schedule or cost and that all development efforts are on schedule as planned. She discussed the following high level major activities and status:

- ◆ Project Preplanning (100% complete)
- ◆ Project Initiation – started in April 2001 (100% complete)
- ◆ Project Management – support piece for the entire effort (72% complete)
- ◆ System Development – over halfway complete (62% Complete)
- ◆ Post Implementation Evaluation (0% complete)

Additional activities and their status:

- ◆ Alignment of SIS and PRISM reports – development complete, testing started
- ◆ Performance Indicators (5) – design complete, development started
- ◆ Reports (redesigned SIS, PRISM) – design completed, development started
- ◆ Confidentiality/Encryption – Administrative Rule drafted, analyzing Rule for impact

Scope:

PRISM - definitions and calculations for the 14 system-wide performance indicators are being developed by the Performance Accountability Policy workgroup. Completed definitions are available for:

- ◆ Employment/Placement Rate (% working after receiving services)

- ❖ Employment Retention Rate (% with earnings in four consecutive quarters)
- ❖ Wage Gain (hourly wage gain one year after beginning work)
- ❖ Welfare Caseload Reduction (compared to legislature goals)
- ❖ Welfare Recidivism (compared to legislature goals)

Of the remaining 9 performance indicators yet to be defined, five are anticipated to be incorporated in PRISM:

- ❖ Increase in Basic Skill Proficiency
- ❖ Demonstrated Competency in Workforce Readiness Skills
- ❖ Completion of Education Degree or Certification
- ❖ Placement in Postsecondary Education or Training
- ❖ Completion of Occupational Skills Training

However, the remaining four may be more difficult to incorporate:

- ❖ Employer Investment in Workforce Development
- ❖ Return on Investment
- ❖ Customer Satisfaction - job seekers
- ❖ Customer Satisfaction - employers

Cost:

- ❖ The chart in the presentation compares the overall budget to actual expenditures. For the period of July 2001 through December 2001, the current budget is \$317k. Expenditures to date are \$45,251, which actually includes the majority of cost through August but the amount listed is only through the end of July as there is a one month lag for getting “actuals”. The maintenance, including the addition of the remaining nine performance indicators, is not yet estimated. Release 2.0 scope and related costs have not yet been defined.

Comments:

- ❖ David Rike inquired as to whether the cost of adding the remaining nine (9) system-wide performance indicators are included in the \$317k total.
- ❖ Kathryn Naugle indicated that it all depends on how much the "maintenance" aspect will cost to include them, as well as the schedule to do so, and when the remaining nine indicators are defined. She also clarified the differences between Release 1.0 and Release 2.0. Release 1.0 mainly consists of modifying the current SIS system, building the new PRISM system, and then adding data to it. Release 2.0 is more about adding system functionality, such as more unit level reporting and specialized reports.
- ❖ Curt Amo recommended that we assign an action item to develop an estimate of the PRISM maintenance costs with a due date of the October Steering Committee meeting.

Action Item: Marc Perrett and Kathryn Naugle will work with Fiscal staff to determine maintenance costs for PRISM Release 1.X to be presented at the October meeting. Estimates should include:

- ❖ Addition of five (5) of the remaining system-wide performance indicators
- ❖ On-going system maintenance:
 - ⇒ *Information Technology Services* (backing up the system, processing data, generating regular reports etc.)
 - ⇒ *Analytical Support*

- ◇ Annette Talbott reported that she had just come from a meeting with Department of Human Resources (DHS) service delivery managers who are also working on their own set of 28 performance indicators due to the re-organization of DHS. She had some concerns that they weren't aware of the 14 OWIB performance indicators and suggested that this group have a conversation with them to ensure that we are not duplicating efforts.

Action Item: Marc Perrett will coordinate potential relationship of 14 system-wide performance indicators and DHS' 29 performance measures with Michael Buckley and Annette Talbott.

4. Review and Approval of Minutes

The minutes for the August 21st meeting were reviewed, moved for approval by Annette Talbott, and seconded by Michael Dougherty.

5. Review draft of SB400 Administrative Rule

The stated purpose of the Administrative Rule is for the “purpose of collecting, analyzing, and sharing statistical and demographic data for the development and reporting of the workforce system performance measures...”. Rick Luthe walked Steering Committee members through the draft Administrative Rule and drew their attention first to definitions:

- ◇ “*Participants*” – current language includes mandatory partners only (partners that provide information), but SB 400 gives latitude and may include “other governmental entities and private organizations”.
- ◇ “*System Administrator*” – is designated by the Oregon Employment Department (OED) Director and OED is custodian of records if participant is not a public agency. Each public agency is custodian for their public records but additionally, each agency is the custodian of records for the information that they submit or receive and any requests for disclosure of system information will be referred to that agency.
- ◇ “*Workforce Investment Act*” – this term is referenced in the bill under “purpose of the system” and to help define who will be designated as participants.

Comments:

David Rike felt it would provide more flexibility if only the agency partner's public title were listed and the individual divisions or departments left off. For example, the words “Department of Human Services” would only be listed instead of including “Children, Adult and Family Services Division” at the end of the title. However, the division names would remain in the actual reports so statistics would still be broken out.

Action Item: Rick Luthe - Eliminate reference to agency individual division and sections from the draft Administrative Rule language.

Data Collection and Disclosure

- ◇ System administrator establishes the format & protocols for data sharing based on objectives articulated in bill
- ◇ Protocols are set by agreement with participants
- ◇ Provisions for informed consent from customers are included
- ◇ Notice of sanctions for unauthorized disclosures by participants or the system administrator are included

By rule, OED will, in consultation with the Education & Workforce Policy Advisor:

- ◆ Adopt procedures to prevent accidental disclosure of confidential information submitted to the system
- ◆ Designate who will be participants in the system

Comments –

In the rule under 015-0020 (1), both David Rike and Annette Talbott asked for clarification on how the term “format” was defined. Marc Perrett clarified that this was not referring to whether it was sent electronically or by tape but whether it was encrypted. Presently, some partners aren’t encrypting their data before transmittal, which is required. Because the wording from SB 400 “...in a format that encodes identifying data...” requires this be done, the corresponding phrase in the Rule is just trying to clarify and tighten up that rule. Final consensus from the committee was to insert SB 400 language “...unique to the mandatory or system partner...” into the rule under 015-0020 (1) to clarify what the word “format” means.

The PRISM Implementation Team will be working on the encryption issue at their next meeting and will then forward their recommendation on to the Steering Committee at the October 23 meeting.

Action Item: Add encryption issue as an agenda item for next Implementation Team meeting

Annette Talbott mentioned that while the Rule has defined the “participants”, it doesn’t define the “recipients” of the data and reports. The question was asked, “Does the rule need to address how the data is to be distributed?”. The statewide aggregate reports are sent out as a public document but each agency receives their own reports and it is up to them to give to whomever they choose.

However, Annette Talbott said that under the SIS program, partners didn’t always share their own information with each other and this had caused some problems. Her concern was that this project doesn’t create more difficulties in agencies’ ability to access information as they have just finally worked out a process that is agreeable to those involved. Marc Perrett agreed but said that really, “disclosure” is what this is all about and that issue would be covered in the individual agreements.

Action Item: Draft disclosure for the distribution for data policy; present it to the Implementation Team for input and recommendations to forward to the Steering Committee.

Action Item: Evelyn will send a copy of the final draft of the Administrative Rule to the Steering Committee one week before the hearing (November 9).

6. Next Steps

The next monthly meeting will be on Tuesday afternoon, October 23rd, from 2:00 – 3:00pm at the Employment Department Building with location to be announced. Whenever possible, the regular Steering Committee meetings will be held the fourth Tuesday of the month, from 2:00 – 3:00pm. The meeting dates for the remainder of this year are listed below. Please mark your calendars accordingly.

- ◆ October 23 2:00 – 3:00pm
- ◆ November 27 2:00 – 3:00pm
- ◆ December 18 2:00 – 3:00pm
- ◆ January 22 2:00 – 3:00pm
- ◆ February 26 2:00 – 3:00pm

◇ March 26 2:00 – 3:00pm

Agenda Items for October:

- ◇ Approval of September Steering Committee minutes
- ◇ Action item status
- ◇ Project status
- ◇ Any issues requiring Steering Committee resolution
- ◇ Other agenda topics TBD

Curt Amo expressed thanks to all for attendance and participation in today's meeting and looks forward to working with all the partners in this project.

Respectfully Submitted,

Evelyn Roth
PRISM Project Coordinator
Employment Department
(503) 947-1833
Evelyn.M.Roth@state.or.us