

**CHAPTER IV**

**CONDUCTING THE REVIEW**

## IV. CONDUCTING THE REVIEW

---

### A. Tripartite Quality Review System

This section provides a description of the tripartite nonmonetary determination quality review system, the procedures for conducting the reviews, and the method for reconciling scores. Each quarter the samples selected by the SWA will be reviewed by a team comprised of nonmonetary determination evaluation experts using the tripartite quality review system.

**The core requirements of the tripartite quality review process include the following:**

1. Each nonmonetary determination in the sample must be independently reviewed and the scoring for each element agreed upon by two individuals with nonmonetary expertise.
2. Each state must be involved in the review of its own sample.
3. The regional office staff will participate annually in at least one tripartite review for each state in the region.

### *The Tripartite Review Process Requirements*

#### **1. Identifying Review Teams.**

In at least one quarter each year, a cross-regional review must be performed for each state by a review team comprised of one BTQ expert from the state being reviewed, one BTQ expert from another state, and one Federal BTQ expert. This team composition, if resources permit, may be used for each quarter.

The tripartite quality review team may conduct on-site or off-site reviews for the other three quarters using three BTQ experts, preferably with staff from the state being reviewed and other state(s). Selecting the review option requires advance consultation between the state staff and regional office staff.

## **2. Assigning Cases.**

Sampled cases selected for review should be assigned according to the tripartite review option being used for the quarter. If the review is off-site, copies of the sampled cases should be mailed directly to the other state or regional office reviewers.

## **3. Reviewing and Scoring Cases.**

The scores of the first reviewer should not be disclosed to the second reviewer prior to his/her independent review of the same cases.

Once the two reviews are completed, the two reviewers must compare their results **element by element**. The two reviewers must agree on the outcome of each element evaluated before an official score is entered into the database. If the reviewers do not agree, the case must be provided to the tie-breaker for an independent evaluation and reconciliation with one of the other reviewers.

The total score for determining nonmonetary determination quality is based on a 100 point scoring system. Five quality elements are evaluated. The score of certain elements directly affects the score on other related elements. For example, if the adjudicator failed to obtain or make a reasonable attempt to obtain relevant and critical information from claimant/employer/others, the appropriate element is scored "not obtained." Because the missing information is critical, the proper application of Law and Policy is questionable, at best, and a score of only 30 out of a potential maximum of 45 points for law and policy is allowed.

Although, data validation elements are not assigned a numeric value, they should be reviewed and evaluated to ensure the SWA's reporting accuracy. They require the same review process as the quality elements. Any element found to be incorrect should be appropriately noted on the Data Collection Instrument and an explanation should be recorded in the comments section.

## **4. Reconciling Scores**

When two reviewers disagree on the outcome for any one of the elements evaluated and cannot reconcile the outcomes, that case will be independently reviewed by the third reviewer. The third reviewer must not be informed of the scores of the first and second reviewers. When the third reviewer completes his/her review, all three reviewers should discuss their results for each disputed element and their reasons for the results. This process provides each reviewer with the opportunity to convince (based on supportable evidence from the case materials) the other

reviewers to alter their results. **At least two of the three reviewers must be in complete agreement on the results for each of the elements.**

The state receives the score of the majority as the official score for the case. The state will enter the official scores for each reviewed case into the UI Required Reports (UIRR) database for transmittal to the National Office, and, at that point, the results are regarded as final.

#### **5. Automatic Calculation of Score.**

Review results for each case are entered on a hard copy score sheet by the review team. Once the case outcomes are resolved through the tripartite review, the official outcome is entered into data entry screens on the SWA's SUN machine. It is not necessary to manually calculate the quality score for each case reviewed. When all the data are entered for a completed case and the case is saved in the database, a review edit module is initiated to ensure that the entry for each element is acceptable. If any unacceptable entries exist, warnings will be displayed. Cases cannot be transmitted until all errors have been corrected. The database is then updated with the completed case data. At the time all case data are transmitted to the National Office UIRR database, a score is calculated for the review period and displayed on the SWA screen.

#### **6. Retain All Case Reviews.**

Current requirements for SWA retention of reported data apply. Hard copies of the Data Collection Instruments from all reviewers may be retained by the SWA for future reference. This information will be helpful in identifying and resolving any inconsistencies in scoring outcomes and in reviewing data validity questions.

#### **7. Use of Sample Data.**

Nonmonetary determination performance will be tracked over time to determine, among other things, trends in performance, problems with particular facets of the nonmonetary process, timeliness of nonmonetary determinations, etc. Each quarter's results will be compared to prior periods of performance to determine if improvement has occurred, particularly if interventions were introduced by the SWA to correct identified performance deficiencies. The data may also be used by state and Federal managers to determine if factors such as fluctuations in the business cycle, changes in personnel, changes in administrative procedures, technological changes, or other conditions affect nonmonetary determinations performance.

## B. Completing the Data Collection Instrument

Each case will be reviewed and completed in its entirety, with **two exceptions**:

1. when case material cannot be found for a sampled nonmonetary determination; or
2. when a case is selected that should not have been included in the sample frame because it is established that the case is either:
  - (a) **invalid** because it does not meet the definition of a nonmonetary determination as described in the ETA 207 reporting instructions contained in ET Handbook 401 (see page I-4-3):
  - (b) **outside the scope** of the review, e.g., nonmonetary redeterminations, BPC crossmatches on uncontested earnings, DUA, TRA, EB.

Although nonmonetary redeterminations are not evaluated, they are considered valid for estimating the number and percentage of cases meeting the data validity criteria. If a nonmonetary redetermination is selected in the sample, the reviewer will enter **N** in element 4, and "**01**" in element 5, to signify that the case is a nonmonetary redetermination. No further review of that case is necessary.

**Cases identified as outside the scope of the quality review or invalid and cases not scored because the case material cannot be found are NOT included in the calculation of quarterly nonmonetary determination quality scores.** Built into this calculation is a function that determines the threshold which the number of cases in these situations cannot exceed in order for the quarter's results to be statistically reliable. Significant numbers of invalid cases drawn in the sample may signify a SWA problem with identifying issues that do not meet data validation criteria, i.e., are not countable for workload.

A message will be generated stating that the scores for the quarter are inconclusive if either of two conditions is met:

1. If the total number of separation cases and/or the total number of nonseparation cases that are not scored because the case material cannot be found, or because they are outside the scope of this review, or because there is "no issue" exceeds 16.7% of either sample (separation or nonseparation) for small states and 25% of either sample (separation or nonseparation) for large states.
2. If the number of separation cases and/or the number of nonseparation cases that are not scored because the case material cannot be found exceeds 10% of the sample (separation or nonseparation). This 10%

threshold for cases that are not scored because the case material cannot be found applies separately from the 16.7% / 25% thresholds for all non-scored cases.

States will be required to select additional sample cases in the subsequent quarter to make up for the cases that could not be scored because the case materials could not be found.

The UI automated system will generate a "show score" screen which includes the number and percentage of invalid cases. The screen will display:

1. Total cases drawn in the sample.
2. The number of cases for which the case material was not found.
3. The number of cases that were outside the scope of the review or were invalid cases.
4. The total number of cases scored.
5. The separation and nonseparation determinations scores.
6. If applicable, a message stating that the scores for the quarter are inconclusive because the total number of cases not scored exceeded either or both of the thresholds for calculating statistically reliable results: the 16.7% / 25% threshold for all non-scored cases and the 10% threshold for cases not scored because the case material is missing.
7. For data validation:
  - (a) the number of invalid cases in the sample; and
  - (b) the percentage of sampled cases that are invalid.

All of this information is accessible in the UI database, where it is stored in the ar9056t, the "transmit" table.

### FORMULAS FOR COMPUTING WEIGHTED SCORES

Notation:

$N_{sq}$  = the population size for separations (ETA 9052 rpt., total intrastate

+ interstate separations) in quarter q

$N_{nsq}$  = the population size for nonseparations (ETA 9052 rpt., total intrastate + interstate nonseparations + total multi-claimants) in quarter q

$n_{sq}$  = the sample size for separations (excluding “no issue” cases, redeterminations, and cases for which materials were not found) in quarter q

$n_{nsq}$  = the sample size for nonseparations (excluding “no issue” cases, redeterminations, and cases for which materials were not found) in quarter q

$x_{sq}$  = the number of scored separation sample cases with a “passing” quality score in quarter q

$x_{nsq}$  = the number of scored nonseparation sample cases with a “passing” quality score in quarter q

The quarterly quality score for separations, expressed as a percentage, is computed by:

$$P_{sq} = x_{sq}/n_{sq} \times 100$$

The quarterly quality score for nonseparations, expressed as a percentage, is computed by:

$$P_{nsq} = x_{nsq}/n_{nsq} \times 100$$

The weighted annual quality score for the separation samples is computed by:

$$P_{ws} = \left( \sum_{q=1}^4 (N_{sq}/N_s) P_{sq} \right)$$

where  $N_s$  is the sum of the separation populations for the four quarters.

The weighted annual quality score for the nonseparation samples is computed by:

$$P_{wns} = \left( \sum_{q=1}^4 (N_{nsq}/N_{ns.}) P_{nsq} \right)$$

where  $N_{ns.}$  is the sum of the nonseparation populations for the four quarters.

If sample cases have been excluded (case materials missing, “no issue” cases and redeterminations), then this will be reflected in the population weighting for

the remaining subgroup  $k$ .

The weighted annual quality score for the separation samples is computed by:

$$P_{sk} = X_{sk}/N_{sk} = N_{sk}^{-1} \sum_{q=1}^4 N_{skq} P_{skq} .$$

$$X_{sk} \text{ is estimated by } \hat{X}_{sk} = \sum_{q=1}^4 \frac{N_{sq}}{n_{sq}^*} x_{sq} , \text{ and}$$

$$N_{sk} \text{ is estimated by } \hat{N}_{sk} = \sum_{q=1}^4 \frac{N_{sq}}{n_{sq}^*} n_{sq}$$

where  $n_{sq}^*$  = the number of sample separations (excluding cases for which materials were not found) in quarter  $q$ .

The weighted annual quality score for the nonseparation samples is computed by:

$$P_{nsk} = X_{nsk}/N_{nsk} = N_{nsk}^{-1} \sum_{q=1}^4 N_{nskq} P_{nskq} .$$

$$X_{nsk} \text{ is estimated by } \hat{X}_{nsk} = \sum_{q=1}^4 \frac{N_{nsq}}{n_{nsq}^*} x_{nsq} , \text{ and}$$

$$N_{nsk} \text{ is estimated by } \hat{N}_{nsk} = \sum_{q=1}^4 \frac{N_{nsq}}{n_{nsq}^*} n_{nsq}$$

where  $n_{nsq}^*$  = the number of sample nonseparations (excluding cases for which materials were not found) in quarter  $q$ .