

MIS Committee Minutes: July 22, 2026

Jack Caltabiano called the meeting to order, noted the tight timeline for final numbers, asked for review of prior minutes, and the group approved the minutes by motion and second.

Mark Vankampen announced desk audits and field visits for annual validation scheduled from late August through early October and clarified that audits will verify eligibility and performance outcomes; he also explained that one of 14 youth program elements (excluding follow-up) must be entered quarterly and that low compliance has reduced reported youth service rates to about 40%, prompting requests for a refresher memo or PowerPoint which Mark agreed to resend.

Participants reported missing roster fields (quarters and credential/skill attainment); Sheryl Hutchison explained that missing data often result from FutureWorks access and the required Swiss agreement, offered to send last year's instructions, and invited affected staff to provide emails for direct assistance.

John Bica explained that USDOL no longer permits self-attestation for income, requiring corroborating documentation (with suggestions like the L077 screen for wages), clarified that status information letters are no longer routinely issued and local entities should proceed with determinations according to policy, and told the group that formal eligibility guidance (a TEGL change) is pending but effectively in force for USDOL; participants asked several clarifying questions about acceptable documentation and timing of the formal guidance and John and Mark committed to circulate supporting guidance and the TEGL reference.

Howard described that state-mandated co-enrollment of RESEA customers led to many RESEA participants being mis-enrolled into Title I adult accounts in Essex County, producing inaccurate adult program listings and records that could not always be corrected after a time threshold. He explained that those misclassifications meant some listed adults were not actually served by the WIOA Adult Program and would appear as missing service documentation during audits. Sheryl was noted as the person investigating potential operational corrections.

Andre Hardy confirmed the problem at a high level, reported that a season of mitigation has moved many records and that cleanup will continue through the validation period, and framed co-enrollment as generally positive for local-area performance because those customers are highly re-employable. He reiterated that the state provided guidance last spring, June 2025, asking local areas to design local business processes for engaging co-enrolled customers, and said the one-stop customer belongs to the local area and should be served by.

Local participants—Barbara, Christopher, Tammy, and Davidene—described concrete communication failures in which Employment Services staff did not notify local partners of co-enrollments, causing vendors to inherit adults on performance rolls without being informed and

harming vendor performance. Hardy responded that central office communicated expectations to board directors and expects those directors and local governance to create and enforce partner communication processes; he acknowledged accountability must be handled locally and that technical assistance is available. Participants urged more structured forums to reconcile local problems and restore consistent information flow among board directors, ES managers, one-stop operators, and vendors.

Attendees agreed that improved local communication channels and reconciliation forums are needed; Tammy and others requested mechanisms for smaller, local problem-solving groups. Hardy clarified existing high-level mechanisms exist for systemwide conversation but committed that DOL will join local conversations and provide technical assistance when a board director formally requests support, including planning meetings and agendas to resolve specific operational issues.

The conversation opened with questions directed to Andre and focused quickly on immediate roster cleanup needs and outstanding adult records that local staff could not correct. Howard and Christopher reported they had resolved many issues but still had adults remaining on rosters that could not be revised before reporting deadlines, prompting a state request to focus on this week's cleanup window.

Howard expanded the problem beyond RESEA to include records entered from other areas and NGOs that local staff did not create as adult enrollments, highlighting cross-area misassignments and the need to identify who actually provided services.

Sheryl Hutchison clarified that AOSOS is the source of record for reporting and that some misclassifications may be unfixable for current reports; she advised local review of rosters and noted that while state staff can assist, anything in AOSOS is the official record and may need a footnote if unchangeable.

Sheryl explained the shift to a local statistical adjustment model using four years of data to predict targets, emphasized it is an imperfect but finer-tuned approach, and described the end-of-PY26 adjustment when actual served customers will inform final expectations.

Howard asked whether people can be removed or reassigned; Sheryl and Mark explained records cannot be removed from reporting and that FutureWorks' local-area assignment logic differs from USDOL reporting, meaning misassigned records may appear on local rosters but will be reported to the correct area by the state.

The group distinguished policy decisions (who should be counted where) from technical MIS coding issues; where local staff face authority limits or coding errors, escalation to WIOAPod or policy review is recommended, and local ES/WF staff should coordinate to resolve simple data entry fixes.

Joan and Kamlesh recommended proactive roster management—pulling FutureWorks rosters each quarter and using weekly receipt reports—plus providing quarterly cleanup lists and generating RC reports months ahead of performance runs. Kamlesh reported that many records were fixed and proposed forwarding reports to ES staff and local areas to prevent future performance reporting issues. 736

Howard asked whether local areas can verify that participants last served by other counties are excluded from their counts and whether an end-of-year roster can be produced to prove it. Sheryl explained that the DOL does not issue individual rosters but that quarterly predictive rosters and FutureWorks dashboard outputs—derived from certified PERL/WIPS data—are the mechanisms locals should use to confirm numerator and denominator counts and detect miscoding ahead of year-end. Joan and Sheryl recommended quarterly cleanup and monitoring to ensure final year counts match expectations.

Howard raised a concrete example of failing a performance measure by a small number of people and emphasized the need to see individual names to understand failures. Sheryl and Joan reiterated that quarterly rosters will show who is counted and that managing miscoding quarterly should clarify whether failures are data issues or programmatic problems. Howard indicated this is a significant issue in his area, not a single case, prompting Hutchison to agree to send a breakdown of existing roster misattributions and to note the problem is more than one but fewer than 45 records. Hutchison also confirmed efforts to ensure FutureWorks roster flaws do not carry into final WIPS reports.

Joan recommended each local area designate one clear person responsible for MIS, quarterly roster checks, and data-entry quality control so problems are identified and escalated to directors and any procedural changes or data-entry rules can be issued. She noted variation across areas in who performs these functions and stressed that empowered ownership prevents end-of-year remediation work.

Kamlesh reported no issues with the current system version and invited questions for his team. Jack reported duplicate participant records in his area; Kamlesh advised sending the duplicates to his team (Workpost Information Systems) so they can investigate and correct them. Funding-year entries for the new year in OSOS were discussed; Emmanuel said funding for WIOA should be entered before the end of the week and that prior-year funding can still be used for data entry and tracking, while other funding sources may be entered by October per DOL guidance.

Denita requested a sample on how to enroll incumbent workers for the next meeting; Jack agreed to contact John to arrange a short presentation and email him about it, while Mark and Kamlesh pointed to an existing New Jersey guide for entering incumbent workers. Christopher

asked about SST coding, and Jack said he would follow up. The meeting concluded with thanks, offers of assistance from Jack and Howard, and the next meeting scheduled for August 26.