

**Workforce Investment Act (WIA)  
ASSET User Group  
Webinar  
Thursday, January 17, 2008**

Approved

**Minutes**

Meeting called to order by Anita Gorham at 9:30 a.m.

Members present: Lynn Krause (01), Sue Wile (02) Stan Kogutkiewicz Vets (02), Anita Gorham (03), Al Hesse (04), Debbie Kelly (05), Jane Spencer (06), Joleen Prentice (07), Richard Price (08), Amy Scarborough (09), Victoria Harmon (10), Kathie Edge (11).

Guests present: Renee Kemp (03), Bruce Larson (03), Rose Zingsheim (03), Deborah O'Leary (07), Tim Hinline (DET/BPMITC), Matt Mita (DET/BPMITC), Diane Bartels (DET/BPMITC), Duane Frisch (DET/BPMITC), Nancy Bryan (Policy)

**Previous Meeting Minutes**

- Changes to previous minutes
  - Under New Business the ASSET update 2.7.5 should read ASSET 2.7.2
- Motion by Al Hesse and seconded by Sue Wile to approve as changed; motion carried.
- The approved minutes will be posted to the User Group website  
[http://www.foxvalleywork.org/asset/asset\\_indexv3.htm/](http://www.foxvalleywork.org/asset/asset_indexv3.htm/) by AL Hesse.
- 

**WAJTE Summary:**

- ASSET User Group wants to review the State's AJL Cost Analysis draft summary after Ron Danowski looks at it and before it is sent to the Secretary.
- The AJL issue paper(s) coming from the Directors need to be comprehensive when submitted to Ron
- Request to be submitted to Tim Hinline for a copy of the current year SLA
- Pros and cons of Common Measures Waiver (see attachment)

**AJLA Updates/Review of Cost Analyst – Tim Hinline/Matt Mita**

- Tim provided an update.
  - There will be a review of a rough draft on January 31, 2008. Ron Danowski does not want to share the 3<sup>rd</sup> draft revision until he has had an opportunity to review it. At that point he will take it to the Secretary and final decision will be made in February. Anita asked if the third revision will include the local information that was collected. Matt stated that his information will be included in that report. He has written a 12 page issue paper on some concerns that are not readily quantifiable. The report submitted by the AUG may or may not be included.
  - Matt stated that his "time trials" did not include complex cases, but did note that in the comments and that complexity would increase times in AJL accordingly. All assumptions made as far as business practices were included in comments, along with a note that not following the assumed business practices would increase times in AJL accordingly. State was unsure how the AUG members came up with their numbers, and would like supporting documentation to show that these numbers were not just pulled "from a hat." It was noted that the Secretary would likely not consider any cost analyses without supporting documentation.
  - Rich stated that our numbers were subjective and that Matt's version only used the first year costs.
  - There was further discussion on the data entry and navigation time with AJL.
  - Nancy asked how staff time was estimated for data collection under Matt's summary. He stated that one cannot anticipate time for complex processes; training is not quantifiable, and the assumptions will not be known until the system is used.

- It was asked if the group would have a chance to provide additional information and input after a decision is made. Tim stated that there won't be time because a final decision will be made in February and that Ron is aware of the concerns of the AUG.
- Richard and Anita suggested that it might be a good idea to put together their own "issue paper" and send it to Ron Danowski. AUG members agreed.

### **WAJTE Meeting**

Al and Rich presented a local AJL cost analysis at the WAJTE meeting to Ron Danowski, Gary Denis and the directors

- Performance is now relatively clean in ASSET; the data has been stable; switching to AJL will probably cause performance problems, maybe not the first year but in subsequent years
- The directors agree AJL is not the way to go as it will be taking many steps backward based on the merits/demerits of the system
- Rich stated that State people need to take notice of what the directors are saying

### **More AJL**

- Matt commented that input from the field came across that ASSET is a bad system. Budget cuts are the primary reason for changing systems
- Nancy stated that our past experience with GSTARS was objective, quantifiable information and commented on the experience with repairing the data in GSTARS
- Ron does not want to share his findings on AJL until he has a clear picture of what the data is saying before he will send it out to everyone
- Sue stated that ASSET has the inability to give ad-hoc reports. AJL has limited ad-hoc capabilities and Matt feels AJL will not give us what we are looking for
- Rich contacted WDA 02 in Kansas and they have created a secondary system to get the reports that they want because they could not get these from AJL.
- Numerous PCRs would be needed to clean up data
- IT has estimates on cost of conversion for hardware and software

### **Costs Associated with ASSET**

- Anita thought that we could eliminate some of the items on the To Do List and get reports directly from TESSA as this would eliminate BITS time creating some of the reports that have been requested.
- Matt stated that maintenance (keeping the system running) and enhancement (changes to the system) are the costs associated with ASSET
- Nancy stated that the SLA (Service Link Agreement) details the budget projections and system needs in an annual budget of \$200,000 of which 75% is generally used for enhancements to ASSET. She noted that in the past, the SLA has been shared with the AUG and asked if the same could be done now. Matt stated that Tim would have to make that decision.
- Dollars could be saved with modifications to Web Intelligence reports as many of these reports are duplicative; Matt noted that approximately 30% of these reports are duplicative and could be eliminated by only using the version of the report using date parameters and eliminating the time specific (e.g. EOM reports) versions. Added efficiency could be added to WEBI if the universes could be combined. Nancy suggested that AUG members who work on developing a list of cost-saving measures examine the potential for TESSA to replace the JCS Data Warehouse.

### **ASSET Updates – Matt Mita/Diane Bartels**

- Discussion on changes to case load report
  - Prior to ASSET 2.7.2 (pre common exits) the case manager would put in the program end date and the client would be off the caseload report
  - With ASSET 2.7.2, only exits will remove an individual from the case load report. Program area end dates do not. Anita has created 3 WebI reports; one each for Youth, Adult & Dislocated Workers that show participants who are no longer receiving Title 1 services and have a Program Area end date entered. These reports give case managers an idea of participants needing follow up-whether or not they are exited. They will also catch those

participants who may 'never' exit due to printing job orders. Duane Frisch recommended that these be a published reports. Anita stressed these reports will not be accurate if the Program Area end date is not entered. (This field is not used for performance reporting, and some WDA's do not bother filling it in). The question was asked if these same reports could be used for active caseloads. Answer: yes, will need to have query pull records with the Program Area end date blank. Anita will send the original reports to Duane for review, publishing and possible revisions to create the active caseload reports. This may be a viable alternative to modifying the system caseload report.

- TABE Issues
  - The discussion involved communication between some local staff and DET staff about entering TABE test scores in ASSET when reminded to do so. Case managers have run into problems while attempting to update participant records with test data. Problems typically arise if the case manager has either failed to report the participant as Basic Skills Deficient, or the test date(s) is outside of the time frames required for pre-testing participants.
  - Basic skills deficiency radio button edit should be relaxed so data corrections will not have to be submitted to properly report this information on the date of first youth service. There is already a PCR to have this done but is on hold until the AJL situation is resolved
  - Case managers need to be more attentive to entering the pre-test data in a timely fashion. Pre-tests must be administered according to Federal timelines and reporting requirements. Post test data also needs to be administered and reported so that youth outcomes can be properly measured.

### **New Business**

- Nancy updated the group on the waiver that DWD may ask DOL for that would allow the State to negotiate performance goals for the six DOL common measures. Pamela O'Brien has the lead in preparing the waiver request. Nancy stated that there are several advantages to making this move, which she has discussed with Ms. O'Brien. Al asked if she would share those thoughts with the AUG. She said she could do that. (NOTE: Nancy sent this information to the AUG shortly after the meeting adjourned.)

### **ASSET To-Do List – Anita**

- All TDLs will remain open pending the AJL decision.

The question was posed should we have a face-to-face meeting in February since January was cancelled due to inclement weather. Anita will defer that decision to Shannon. Diane will check to see if a room at GEF 1 is already scheduled for February 28 AUG meeting.

A motion to adjourn the Webinar was made at 11:40 by Lynn Krause and seconded by Amy Scarborough.

Submitted by Debbie Kelly (WDA05)