

ATTACHMENT C

UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE REEMPLOYMENT SERVICES AND ELIGIBILITY ASSESSMENT (RESEA) DATA CONCERNS

The list below has been developed to help continuing states in reviewing their current ETA required reports. The list identifies data problems that have occurred in some states and that must be corrected. Each quarter, the ETA National Office provides states and regional offices a spreadsheet that summarizes the program data. States should use the spreadsheets and the list below to assess whether there are data problems. Proposals by states must address, in the narrative description of data reporting problems, all problems identified in these data spreadsheets. The state's response to these concerns will be evaluated before funding the RESEA grant for Fiscal Year 2016. States must describe their plans to implement corrections and include a projected timeline for completion in the supplemental budget request.

States should account for 100 percent of the scheduled and rescheduled UI REAs or RESEAs on the ETA 9128 forms submitted. If the state is not meeting this percentage, a narrative should explain the steps that will be taken to correct this problem.

Each claimant that is scheduled for a UI RESEA (or REA) may participate or fail to participate. If the claimant fails to participate, the claimant may or may not be disqualified depending on the reason the claimant failed to participate and how the issue was addressed by the state. For example, claimants who have returned to work or could not report due to a job interview are also not disqualified. States are currently required to use the National Directory of New Hires to determine whether the claimant failed to report due to employment. If the claimant fails to participate in the UI RESEA, states are required to adjudicate the issue that results. It is not required that the claimant be rescheduled. The number of claimants scheduled for a UI RESEA must be equal to the number of claimants who completed a UI RESEA and the number of claimants who failed to complete a UI RESEA. If this total is not 100 percent of the scheduled UI RESEAs, the state should examine the population that is not explained by the data. Since the UI RESEA may be scheduled in one quarter and the claimant may report or fail to report in a subsequent quarter, these percentages should average out to 100 percent over multiple calendar quarters.

ETA 9128 Workloads Report

A. UI RESEAs Scheduled (Item 2)

This number should include the number of scheduled initial and subsequent RESEAs and should be compared to the number of UI REAs or RESEAs for which the state received funding. States should be scheduling quarterly UI RESEAs at a sufficient level to ensure that the state will reach its funding level at the end of the year.

UI RESEAs Scheduled should be approximately the sum of Item 3 *UI RESEAs Completed* and Item 15 *No-shows*. **Note:** Although there is some variation between quarters, this difference should even out over the year.

B. Reemployment Services or Training (Item 4)

All UI RESEAs must include referral to a reemployment service. If the count in this item (Item 4) is significantly less than the count in Item 3 *UI RESEAs Completed*, claimants may not be reporting as directed, they may not be referred as required, or the reemployment service providers may not be providing the appropriate workload count.

C. Disqualifications or Overpayments (Item 7)

If this number is large compared to the number of UI RESEAs completed it is possible that the state is counting disqualifications or overpayments that are not a part of the UI RESEA. Both disqualifications and overpayments must be based on issues that were discovered as a result of the UI RESEA.

D. Separation Issues (Item 8)

If this number is large compared to the number of UI RESEAs completed, it is possible that the state is counting disqualifications that are not a part of the UI RESEA. If the number is correct, the state should evaluate the initial claims process to determine if questions asked are not sufficient to identify separation issues.

E. Other Disqualifications (Item 12)

If this number is large compared to the number of UI RESEAs completed, the state should review the disqualification codes to ensure that these issues should not instead be counted in items 8, 9, 10, or 11. The category *Other* should be used only when the disqualification does not fit in these other categories.

F. No-Shows (Item 15)

Each claimant who fails to report for a UI RESEA must be referred to adjudication to determine whether they had good cause for failing to report and if they were able and available for work. This item should be approximately equal to the sum of items 16, 17, 18 and 21.

G. Disqualifications for Failure to Report (Item 17)

If the count is significantly lower than the number of no-shows, the state should ensure that those claimants who fail to report are being referred to adjudication.

H. No Disqualification (Item 21)

All claimants who failed to report and were not disqualified and not rescheduled should be counted.

I. Returned to Work (Item 22)

The Social Security number of claimants counted in Item 21 should be matched to the National Directory of New Hires to determine whether they have returned to work.

ETA 9129 Outcomes Report

The average duration is calculated by dividing the *Total Weeks Compensated* by the *Number Who Established a UI Benefit Year in the Report Quarter*. These elements are located in items 1a and 1b. The exhaustion rate is calculated by dividing the *Number Exhausting Benefits* by the *Number Who Established a Benefit Year in the Report Quarter*. These elements are located in items 1a and 1e. Both the average duration and exhaustion rate should be reasonably similar to the state's average duration and exhaustion rate for the report quarter. If the duration is higher than the maximum number of regular UI weeks, the program may be incorrectly including Extended Benefit payments. If the duration and exhaustion rate are very low, the program may be incorrectly including only one calendar quarter rather than the complete benefit year.

There should be some correlation between the average duration and the benefits per claimant. For example, if the average duration differs between the two groups by one week, then the benefits per claimant should differ by an amount approximately equal to the average weekly benefit amount for the state. If not, it is likely that there are programming problems.

If there are very large variances in the percentages between quarters, it is likely that there are programming problems.