

MIS Meeting: March 25

The meeting opened with roll call and small-group introductions, noting representatives from Monmouth, Equus at Hudson, and other New Jersey attendees and previews of conference locations for upcoming years. The chair prepared to start the agenda and allowed a brief moment for stragglers to join.

Jack confirmed the group had reviewed January minutes, explained the missed meeting due to snow, and requested a motion to approve; Davidene moved to approve and the minutes were accepted by voice vote. Jack then outlined the meeting agenda and introduced the first substantive topic on RESEA co-enrollment issues.

RESEA Co-enrollment — WISE Team Introduction and Status

Kamlesh and Manny from the WISE team described coordination with local staff to implement processes preventing future incorrect exits and enabling record changes, and they reported assistance provided to staff to change EC co-enrollment records from adult to dislocated worker.

Emmanuel (Manny) explained three remediation subsets: straightforward deletions and re-adds, records requiring back-out of enrollments for exited customers, and complex cases blocked by 90-day gap errors where subsequent enrollments prevent simple fixes; Davidene proposed staff follow-ups for unfixable records while the team explores a vendor script for retroactive fixes.

Jaime and others raised concerns that RESEA participants placed into training or given tuition waivers could trigger measurable skill gain or credential measures and require follow-up, noting even small counts can affect performance; Kamlesh suggested biweekly or weekly reports to detect mis-entries early.

WFNJ Dashboard Submission, Validation, and Next Steps

Denise Taguwa reported that local reps and her team are addressing frozen cells and formula issues as they arise, that roughly 95% of dashboards are received timely, and that her team is reviewing dashboards, performing random OSOS checks, and planning deeper reviews to identify common errors and activity patterns for follow-up with local areas and WDBs.

The final segment in the provided transcript included procedural clarifications on dashboard compliance, acknowledgment that training was provided to some areas, a request that common issues be shared broadly, and Davidene's confirmation that sharing findings through the MIS committee or WDBs would be helpful.

Diane Paz asked whether AOSOS will be phased out and whether policy work should anticipate a new system. Kamlesh Patel confirmed DOL plans to move to a new system, that management is handling the effort, and that a vendor will be selected after the RFP is complete; he estimated implementation within about a year but did not commit to a firm date.

Jaime Gomez asked about a WFNJ dashboard previously shown, and Denise Taguwa said the dashboard is part of the NOA addendum and her team is improving it to ease local reporting. Kamlesh Patel and Denise explained the dashboard is under management review, will include service/activity and demographic views, requires approval before distribution to local areas, and may be produced monthly or quarterly after initial delivery.

Recording services, co-enrollment, and funding implications

Jaime raised how to enter training or supportive services for WFNJ customers when training is not paid by the program and asked whether others record such services as non-ITA. Laurie confirmed Camden uses non-ITA entries for self-enrolled WFNJ participants. Mark Vankampen and Davidene Alpart clarified that service type depends on the activity and funding source, that non-ITA trainings do not hit adult performance measures unless funded as adult, and that documentation is typically placed in comments and IEP updates.

Participants raised whether adult participants can opt out of follow-up at intake and the operational impact of allowing immediate sign-off, noting counselor time and follow-up effort concerns. John Bicica and Mark Vankampen referenced existing guidance and the need to clarify whether follow-up applies only to participants in unsubsidized placement,

Attendees described local practices where intake opt-out forms were created and board-approved, with one county using a form for about three years without monitoring issues. Jack emphasized that local areas should document opt-out decisions, obtain signatures, and file notes in participant folders to cover monitoring requirements.

Laurie raised problems with AOSOS selective-service prompts for summer youth who turned 18 and whose records remain open because they lacked exit data or SSNs, asking whether records should be hard-exited. John acknowledged participants should be offered year-round services and asked Laurie to email him with bullets describing the issue so his team can follow up.

The meeting concluded with thanks to participants, confirmation of the next meeting date of April 22 at 10:00 AM, and closing remarks from multiple attendees.

*** The next meeting is scheduled for April 22 at 10:00 AM**