PRISM

(Performance Reporting Information System Management)
Steering Committee

February 26, 2001, Meeting Minutes

Attendees: David Rike (ODE); Michael Buckley (DHS); Annette Talbott (GO); Cam Preus-Braley (CCWD); Debbie Lincoln, Michael Dougherty, Curt Amo, Kathryn Naugle, Marc Perrett, Evelyn Roth, (OED)

Absent: None

Presiding: Debbie Lincoln

1. Welcome and Introductions

2. Updates

- *Interagency Agreement status* – The agreement was signed by all PRISM partners by the end of January 2002 and is formally in place.
- *Project costs to date* - Approximately $507k out of the total of $570k has been expended. There are still some small expenditures to be accounted for.
- *Post-Implementation Evaluation Results* – an overview of these results are listed below:

  Significant risks and how they were addressed
  ° Project was schedule and cost driven instead of scope
    ° *Mitigated by reducing scope to replicat SIS database design and reports*

  Factors that *positively* affected project
  ° Partner interaction
  ° Had an approved charter with clearly defined scope

  Factors that *negatively* affected project
  ° Performance Indicators not as clearly defined as expected, required additional effort to finalize
  ° Multiple stakeholders led to coordinating challenges
  ° PRISM reports shows less detail than SIS reports in some areas

  Key things learned
  ° Identify all global issues up front
  ° Multiple partners make it more complex
  ° Look at future impacts of decision (e.g. impact of sunsetting SIS)

- *Action Items* – Status is listed below:

Action Item	Assigned to	Status
Determine final status of project cost	Project Managers	In-process
Acquire all necessary signatures on Interagency Agreement	Project Managers	Done
Complete Post-Implementation Evaluation	Project Managers	Done
Finalize and prioritize partner requests	Project Managers	In-process
Develop conceptual design for next release	Project Managers	Pending
Identify funding options for next release	Project Managers	In-process

- *Legislative Concept to sunset SIS* - Michael Dougherty
  Some partners are now submitting data to both SIS and PRISM. By the end of this biennium there will have enough historical information in PRISM that there will no longer be a need to maintain SIS. In order to eliminate this redundancy, we would like to propose creating a legislative concept to sunset SIS at the end of this current biennium. This would include:
  - Revision of language to include these partners
  - Revision of language to separate "non-workforce" partners from "statewide" total.

  Discussion:
  David Rike inquired if there was a possibility of adding some of the remaining SIS partners to PRISM, and if so, this might be an opportunity to amortize some of the total cost. Michael Dougherty agreed and stated that the next step might be to have some discussions with them and take an informal survey of those SIS partners to see if they would see a value in continuing to submit data but with PRISM. Obviously, funding issues would need to be part of that discussion. Michael Buckley asked if anyone knew all the partners listed in the SIS contract and no one present knew the complete list for sure.

  Action Item: Michael Dougherty will talk with SIS Oversight Committee regarding the sunset of SIS and it's implications.
  Action Item: Evelyn Roth list all partners included in the SIS agreement in the meeting minutes.

  The agencies included in the current SIS Interagency Agreement are listed below:
  Agencies that are **required** to participate:
  - *Department of Human Services/Adult and Family Services*
  - *Department of Education*
  - *Employment Department*
  - *Department of Community Colleges and Workforce Development*
  - *Oregon University System (previously the State System of Higher Education)*
  - *Department of Human Services/Vocational Rehabilitation Program*

  Agencies that **volunteer** to participate include but not limited to:
  - *Department of Administrative Services/Oregon Health Plan Policy & Research*
  - *Bureau of Labor & Industries*
  - *Department of Consumer & Business Services/ Workers' Compensation Division*
  - *Department of Corrections*

3. **Reports**
   Evelyn Roth and Marc Perrett handed out copies of the draft PRISM reports with the caveat that they are not for distribution at this time. The reports are to be reviewed today for form and format only, as they still need to undergo review for data quality and integrity by Employment analysts. Once this analysis is complete, PRISM partner staff will review them further.

   Discussion:
   Debbie Lincoln questioned why there were big swings and drops in some of the data. Marc Perrett responded that there are some outlyers that are affecting the data that need to be further examined. Annette Talbott suggested adding a definition of each specific indicator on the corresponding report for reference by the end users.

4. **SIS/PRISM Funding Options**
   The following discussion concerned the two funding options listed below:

   Option 1: <u>Shared, fixed biennial cost</u>
   > *Unchanged each biennium, equally shared* (current SIS funding model): ability to develop new system features and capabilities is restricted by available funds

   Option 2: **<u>Shared, variable biennial cost</u>**
   > *Changes each biennium, but equally shared*: costs for new system features and capabilities are shared by partners in biennium incurred

   <u>Discussion</u>:
   Both Annette Talbott and David Rike voiced concerns regarding either option and suggested that for more clarity, the budget should be broken out separately into maintenance/operations and system enhancements. Michael Buckley said that Option 2 sounded like costs would vary and partners would be locked into that option long-term. Cam Preus-Braly mentioned that the word "new" used in each of the two options made her uncomfortable. David Rike suggested that staff develop a timeline that would separate out both on-going maintenance and system enhancements, displayed over a period of years so partners would have a better indication of the overall budget impact when making a funding decision.

   Action Item: OED staff develop a timeline that displays maintenance and operations costs plus enhancements.

   Annette Talbott inquired if there was any of the remaining grant funds could be applied towards the needed increase of funding to support both SIS and PRISM systems. Michael Dougherty replied that when the grant expired as of December 31, 2001, there would be approximately $45k unspent that OED had planned to return to DOL. Cam suggested going back and reviewing the grant to see if the remaining monies could be used by some of the partners instead of returning the funds. Annette concurred, saying we have until the end of the first quarter to submit the final expenditures report to DOL.

   Action Item: Michael Dougherty will explore options with partners to use up remaining 1-Stop grant funds.

5. **Request for Enhancements Matrix**
   Committee members discussed the suggested enhancements and their definitions listed in the meeting packet (page 8) which were as follows:
   a) **Database Queries** - restricted (partner only) access to agency's information; create own data downloads and customized reports
   b) **Online Dynamic Reports** - locals and general public access to standard set of data, with ability to select, screen and manipulate available data
   c) **Agency Specific Custom Reports** - standardized set of reports developed to partner agency's specifications
   d) **Collection of Additional Data** - (I.e. create field for student ID number, create industry code on wage file)
   e) **Addition of remaining performance indicators**

Annette Talbott made the observation that a piece missing from the matrix was what do the "locals" want in terms of system enhancements. She asked if staff intended to gather any input from this group of partners. Marc Perrett said that while this point had been discussed, we had not yet asked for their input.

Action Item: Marc Perrett will gather "local partner" input to add to the enhancement matrix

Regarding the collection of additional data, David Rike added that he believes adding a student ID number would benefit all partners. It adds value to the entire system because it would enable partners to track juveniles using services who may not have social security numbers. Currently, the Department of Education does not verify social security numbers so the student ID number was created to assign each student a unique identifier.

6. **Closing**
   As there were a number of issues that needed further research and discussion to be resolved, Debbie Lincoln recommended that the committee reconvene again in April. She also suggested that we extend that regularly scheduled meeting from one hour to two, in order to provide enough time for a more thorough discussion on system funding and enhancements.

7. **Recap of action items:**
   - Michael Dougherty will have a discussion with SIS Oversight Committee regarding the sunset of SIS and it's implications.
   - Evelyn Roth list all partners included in the SIS agreement in this meetings minutes
   - OED staff develop a timeline that shows maintenance and operations costs plus enhancements
   - Michael Dougherty explore options with partners to use up remaining 1-Stop grant funds
   - Marc Perrett will gather "local partner" input to add to the enhancement matrix

8. **Next Steps**
   The next monthly meeting will be on Tuesday afternoon, April 23rd, from 2:00 – 4:00pm at the Employment Department Building, Administrative Conference Room.

Respectfully Submitted,

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