PRISM Steering Committee Meeting
February 25, 2003

Present: Curt Amo, Aaron Hughes, Greg White, Marc Perrett, Evelyn Roth, John Glen, Bill Farmer

Absent: Debbie Lincoln, Michael Buckley, Cam Preus-Braly, Doug Kosty

1. Welcome & Introductions

2. Updates

System Reports - John Glen - There are over 500 current SIS and PRISM reports now posted to the PRISM website, www.PRISM.state.or.us .   The Placement reports are now up-to-date and all the others will be soon.

Marc Perrett mentioned that he has just noticed right before the meeting that the Placement reports for 2001 and 2002 were identical by regions on the web site. John will correct this error and check to make sure there are no other duplicate reports posted. He mentioned that under the current structure, all reports are generated at once and then the IT staff have to go in and link each report to the specific spot on the site page. The Information Technology staff are working on a process that will automate this manual process so we will no longer have to create individual links which have to be validated individually.

Greg White commented that he had noticed in the past there had been some holes in various reports but that they seem to be improved lately. However, he wondered what had happened to Perkins post secondary reports as that data wasn't included in the current reports.   John Glen explained that the indicator calls for goals in the reports and because the Post-Secondary data (Perkins) has no goals (of employment), they don't show up. The Placement reports require a goal of "employment" whereas the other two reports don't. Greg suggested that perhaps we should add a note of explanation about the calculation, stating that this report doesn't have to have a goal and how that is related to the content of the report. It's an important piece of information but the explanation needs to be written simply.

Action Items:
  - ➢ **(John Glen) – validate that there are no duplicates in web report links**
  - ➢ **(John Glen) – add note of explanation regarding the lack of "goals" for post-secondary data**

Aaron Hughes wondered if there were any CAF reports that were not yet on the web site.   John reported that the Caseload Reduction reports are current for December 01 to 02.   However, CAF is changing the definition on cases that don't return after 18 months and will be resubmitting the report within a day or two.

Quarterly Episode Counts Report
The most recent version of this report was handed out to committee members. This quarterly report shows the actual new records sent by quarter and program area. John Glen has asked the programs to have all data in by March 15 in order to meet the report publication deadline of April 9. Title II will not be submitting their data until the end of summer, as they submit once a year.

Phase 2.0 - Database Queries
This development piece is currently on schedule for completion by June 30, 2003.

3. Discussions
Senate Bill 250 – The primary purpose of this bill is to start the process of shutting down SIS, name PRISM as the workforce performance system that helps partners, OWIBS and others working under the umbrella of WIA, and allows greater flexibility in the operation of PRISM. If SB 250 is approved, no new data will be entered into the SIS system after December of this year and there will be more flexibility to include additional partners in the system. Specific language in the bill was added that states "…public bodies and private organizations that have been approved by the Director of Employment Department, in consultation with…". We believe that we could absorb a certain number of new members without much affect on the system and current partners. The bill was before the Labor and Senate Committee several times as it was held over for discussion until we were able to assure the committee that no general funds would be used to support the system during the next biennium.

Informed Consent - During a recent discussion on this subject, we came across an issue that possibly needs a refresher conversation. The question was – "Do we need to give an applicant the ability to say no to the use of their SSN for performance purposes", and how does this differ from "implied consent"? While all PRISM partners use their own versions of informed consent, it was originally agreed upon that when requesting an individual to disclose his or her social security number, we must inform that individual on the following three things:

    1) whether that disclosure is mandatory or voluntary,
    2) by what statutory or other authority the number is solicited, and
    3) what uses will be made of it."

Upon re-examination of the Attorney General's opinion on SIS, it appeared that there might be a fourth component of informed consent we might want to consider, related to giving customers the choice to either opt-in or opt-out on letting the system use their SSN for performance purposes.

Greg White questioned whether there might be an education component of this, such as how we ask the questions of our customers? There might be a way we could increase the percentage while we continue to get informed consent from our customers. Graham suggested that perhaps we should look at other agency informed consent wording as

there are various ways to increase the percentage of agreement and thus usage. The primary issue is that we still allow them to say no without impacting their benefits. Graham reiterated that this is just a heads-up, that we would like partners to think about this issue, just in case.

Funding proposal for 2003 / 2005 – Graham led this discussion and walked the group through the process and model currently being proposed. He emphasized that this is merely the first look at this proposal and wanted to put the following information forward for discussion:

Assumptions

1)   The total PRISM budget for the 2003-2005 biennium will be $440,000.

   a)   This includes the continuation of minimal work with SIS.

   b)   This is consistent with 2001-2003 levels and consistent with what the primary partners would be expecting.

   c)   This will require careful resource allocation in Research and ITS, and between the two divisions.

2)   All four current PRISM participants – ODE, OED, DHS, and DCCWD – will continue to support the program at roughly the same level as they did in the 2001-2003 biennium.

3)   Other agencies, including three that are SIS participants but not currently PRISM participants, might want to join PRISM.

Explanation of Funding Proposal

1)   All of our proposed options use the same basic principle:

   a)   First, determine the basic "data submission costs" for each agency, based on levels identified in a recent policy paper relating to special UI wage record / SSN matching projects.

      i)   These costs are $500 for matching fewer than 500 SSNs; $1,000 for matching 500-9,999 SSNs; $1,500 for matching 10,000 or more SSNs.

      ii)   Given that the basic timeline for PRISM involves quarterly data submissions, we estimated the total number of records that each would submit quarterly; then applied the amounts shown in i). and multiplied by eight (the number of quarters in a biennium).

   b)   Second, determine how much of the $440,000 remains, once these data submission costs have been identified.

   c)   Allocate the remaining (infrastructure) costs across all participating agencies, based on a weighting system that assigns more of the infrastructure costs to those agencies that are current / historical PRISM participants than to those who may join in the coming biennium.

i)   This weighting system attempts to reflect the fact that the four current PRISM participants have already indicated a commitment to the program's goals; potential participants who may join in the future will initially have less stake in the underlying infrastructure.

ii)   These weights can be adjusted annually to reflect changes in an agency's longevity with and commitment to the infrastructure.

2)   The five options shown represent different participation levels, ranging from "just the four current PRISM participants" to "all PRISM and SIS participants, plus two new participants."

a)   As new participants are added, the cost for existing participants goes down, for two reasons. First, the new participants pay for their data submissions, thereby lowering the amount that has to be considered as underlying infrastructure. Second, the new participants share the cost of the underlying infrastructure, thereby reducing the share allocated to the other agencies.

The above proposal would include minimal work on SIS (mainly maintenance) and careful resource allocation, with all current work efforts continuing. What we have proposed to do is bring the funding level down for small agencies so they could afford to participate. We believe that gradually over time, participating partners will begin to see a difference in the cost allocations. There is a limit as to how far we can go without going above the 440k amount but the overall work won't increase all that much as long as we don't add multitudes of additional agencies.

Aaron Hughes commented that if the Preferred Worker Program wanted to participate and submitted many of their records, the total amount of records could greatly increase. Marc Perrett agreed, stating that it might be the same for parts of Education. Greg White commented that private agencies spend big dollars on getting this type of information so they might be really interested in this. Graham Slater added that his Research section has already responded to one private entity. He serves on the Private Schools Advisory Board and so will keep this committee informed of any new interest in the PRISM system. Greg mentioned that private career schools currently use the same AG's opinion on the informed consent as we do so if they come on board down the road, they would most likely already be in compliance with the system's criteria.

Graham added that there are some additional considerations that we need to keep in mind as we think about using this funding model, which are as follows:

1)   Potential new PRISM members are not used to paying anything towards the maintenance of the system. In order to attract them, we believe it is important to keep their costs as low as possible in the immediate term with the goal that long-term, they will take on a larger share of the infrastructure maintenance.

2)   We need to market PRISM, particularly addressing reasons why agencies would do better to join PRISM than to run single UI Wage Record / SSN matches. These reasons include:

a) PRISM permits comparisons of different programs, different characteristics of the individuals, etc.

b) PRISM provides a consistent means of measuring performance results.

c) PRISM allows customized, ad hoc reports based on all the characteristics the agencies provide us with.

d) PRISM has data clean-up / review methodologies in place.

4. Next Steps

Next meeting date – Several months ago there was some committee discussion around whether there was only the need to meet quarterly, because the system was no longer in a development mode. After more discussion, the decision was made to next meet on April 22, 2003 to finalize the funding process and in case there were any problems with SB 250 proceeding. This group will then plan to meet next on June 24th, once the legislative session is final.

Action Item:
- **(Graham and Evelyn) - conduct individual visits with the threee partners unavailable at the meeting today, to discuss the following three items:**
  - **Senate Bill 250**
  - **Update in Informed Consent**
  - **Proposed funding model**

Minutes were approved by general consent.

Action Item:
- **(Evelyn) - send any updates on the SB 250 progress, especially when the bill gains approval**

Meeting adjourned at 2:55pm.

Respectfully Submitted,

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