TRAINING AND EMPLOYMENT NOTICE	NO. 3-15
	DATE July 27, 2015

TO: STATE WORKFORCE AGENCIES
STATE WORKFORCE LIAISONS
UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE DIRECTORS

FROM: PORTIA WU
Assistant Secretary

SUBJECT: Reengineering Unemployment Insurance (UI) Benefits Program Accountability Processes: Update on Implementation Progress and State Impacts

1. **Purpose.** To update state workforce agencies on the Employment and Training Administration's (ETA) efforts to reengineer UI benefits program accountability processes to improve program performance and integrity and to provide more information on state impacts and timelines for implementation.

2. **References.**
   - Section 303(a)(1) of the Social Security Act (SSA);
   - 20 CFR Parts 602-617, 625, 640, and 650;
   - Unemployment Insurance Program Letter (UIPL) No. 22-10, *Selecting and Monitoring At-Risk States for Continuous Improvement and Compliance with First Payment Timeliness and First Level Appeals Promptness*;
   - UIPL No. 33-11, *Identification of "Improper Payment High Priority States" for Unemployment Insurance (UI)*;
   - UIPL No. 17-14, *Revised Employment and Training (ET) Handbook No. 336, 18th Edition: "Unemployment Insurance (UI) State Quality Service Plan (SQSP) Planning and Reporting Guidelines"*;
   - Training and Employment Notice (TEN) No. 8-14, *Reengineering Unemployment Insurance (UI) Benefits Program Accountability Processes*;
   - ET Handbook No. 301, 5th Edition, *UI Performs: Benefits Timeliness and Quality Nonmonetary Determinations Quality Review*, Pages IV-1 through IV-7;
   - ET Handbook No. 382, 3rd Edition, *Handbook for Measuring Unemployment Insurance Lower Authority Appeals Quality*, Page 9;
   - ET Handbook No. 395, 5th Edition, *Benefit Accuracy Measurement State Operations Handbook*;
   - ET Handbook No. 396, 4th Edition, *Unemployment Insurance Benefit Accuracy Measurement Monitoring Handbook*, Chapter V; and
   - ET Handbook No. 407, *Tax Performance System Handbook*.

3. **Background.** ETA issued TEN No. 8-14 on September 2, 2014, to announce the reengineering of the processes used for UI benefit program accountability. The TEN articulated ETA's goals for this initiative which include, among others, a new suite of accountability processes that focuses on operational capacity in addition to accuracy and timeliness; that recognizes both Federal and state capacity; and that ensures the UI program is administered with a focus on accountability and integrity. We also shared ETA's intention of significant state engagement throughout the process. With assistance from the National Association of State Workforce Agencies (NASWA), several state subject matter experts (SMEs) have been actively participating in the workgroups carrying out reengineering efforts that have specific state impact.

ETA's Steering Committee overseeing this initiative held an in-person meeting earlier this calendar year to plan out the remaining work necessary to achieve full implementation and to refine the timeline(s) of the project. This TEN provides new information to states on the accomplishments of the initiative to date; provides more information on the new accountability processes focused on UI operations; and shares timelines for various components of the reengineering effort.

4. **Summary of Reengineering Framework.**

In TEN No. 8-14, ETA provided information on the basic framework of the Reengineering process. They are summarized here for easy reference.

There are five key areas of change that make up the proposed new framework:

a) **Changes to the State Quality Service Plan (SQSP) process.** The primary change related to the SQSP process is the move from an annual cycle to a biennial cycle. A biennial cycle is intended to enable states to use the SQSP process more strategically and to provide states with additional time to focus on actual implementation of process improvements and corrective actions. Additional changes are currently being made to streamline the reporting process, particularly for Corrective Action Plans (CAPs).

b) **Changes to the Frequency and Logistics of Federal/State Peer Reviews for Benefit Accuracy Measurement (BAM), Benefits Timeliness and Quality (BTQ) for non-monetary determinations, and Appeals.** The framework includes changes in the frequency of BAM and BTQ peer review cycles and a different approach to organizing the peer reviews with a focus on a national rather than regional approach and the addition of more formal training elements as part of the review.

c) **Development of new processes to support state and Federal operational reviews of UI program administration as it relates to benefits.** One of the most important features in the framework is a design that better supports states' improvements in their benefit operations and processes. Using the Tax Performance System (TPS) model, the framework includes a new process for independent state self-assessments of operational practices for the various functional areas of benefit operations (described in detail in

section 5(E) below). Similar to the TPS model, ETA proposes providing states with designated funding to support an independent reviewer to conduct the self-assessment. This approach will support state identification of operational issues that require new strategies to pursue on a continuous basis, inform ETA's technical assistance efforts nationally and with individual states, and will enable a more robust and effective collection and dissemination of state best practices.

d) **Development of a new process for identifying states that are determined to be "At Risk" and in need of more intensive technical assistance**. Described further in 5(F) below, the new framework calls for a new single definition of "At Risk" states that combines the issues of poor performance related to timeliness and/or improper payments with information on states' operational issues that will be gleaned from the states' self-assessments, described in section 5(E) below, and ETA Regional Office monitoring. The objective for this designation will remain the same – to provide those states having the most challenges related to program performance or administrative operational issues with intensive technical assistance to support improved performance.

e) **Development of new methods to leverage the skills of both ETA and state staff to support technical assistance and performance improvement**. A final element of the new framework is to approach ETA's on-site reviews and technical assistance efforts in a different manner. ETA's on-site monitoring reviews include a combination of both monitoring and technical assistance. To better support the technical assistance elements in on-site reviews of states that are designated as "At Risk," ETA is planning a new process to deploy ETA staff with the appropriate subject matter expertise in "expert teams." ETA also intends to invite state experts to participate on these teams to help provide a greater depth of knowledge and peer-to-peer technical assistance with regard to state benefit operations. The state SMEs role on the teams will be solely to provide technical assistance. State SMEs have already been consulted in developing suggested criteria for states to use in selecting state SMEs to participate on these expert teams.

5. **Implementation Status Update By Activity.**

   A. **State Quality Service Planning (SQSP) Process.**

      Overview of Processes Being Changed. The SQSP has moved from an annual cycle to a biennial cycle that was implemented with the Fiscal Year (FY) 2015 SQSP cycle. As part of the new process, one-half of the states provided a two-year SQSP in FY 2015 and the other one-half of the states are in the process of developing their two-year SQSP plan for this FY 2016 SQSP cycle. As part of the new process, a new standardized Corrective Action Plan (CAP) monitoring tool has been developed. This CAP monitoring tool will serve a dual purpose: 1) to report CAP as part of the SQSP process, and 2) to provide quarterly updates by the states.

      Implementation Progress to Date. UIPL No. 17-14 implemented changes to the SQSP process by moving the SQSP process from an annual process to a two-year biennial cycle.

The new CAP report form has been developed in Microsoft Excel Workbook and is expected to make the CAP process and quarterly reporting more efficient by preventing duplication of information.

Additional Implementation Steps and Timelines. We expect to pilot the use of the CAP monitoring tool in several states as part of the FY 2016 SQSP process. Comments received from the volunteer states will be reviewed for implementation into the final CAP monitoring tool, which will require formal clearance under the Paperwork Reduction Act. The ET Handbook No. 336 will be updated to reflect the revised CAP form and instructions issued as part of the annual FY 2017 SQSP guidance.

B. Benefit Timeliness and Quality Reviews

Overview of Processes Being Changed. The Benefits Timeliness and Quality (BTQ) Cross Regional Tripartite Review will now be referred to as the National BTQ Review (NBTQR). Beginning in FY 2016, the NBTQR will be held triennially (every three years) instead of annually. The NBTQR will be jointly coordinated by Regional Offices (RO) and National Office (NO) BTQ coordinators. The review team for the NBTQR will consist of at least one representative from each of the states administering the program as well as the BTQ coordinator from each ETA Regional Office and the BTQ coordinator from the National Office. Finally, the re-engineered approach to the National BTQ Review will also allow states to electronically transmit documents by uploading information to a secure Website. Sample sizes, as well as the subsampling process conducted by the National Office, will remain the same. During the other two years of the triennial cycle, ETA will provide state training and technical assistance.

Implementation Progress to Date. To date, the BTQ sub-workgroup, comprised of Federal and State members, has completed the update of ET Handbook No. 301, *UI Performs: Benefits Timeliness and Quality (BTQ) Nonmonetary Determination Quality Review.*

Additional Implementation Steps and Timelines. The ET Handbook No. 301 has been updated and revised to incorporate the new process. We project the release of the revised ET Handbook 301, 5th Edition, Change 2, in in the spring of 2016. Following release of the revised handbook, ETA expects to schedule training webinars with the states to review the changes and provide guidance on implementation of the changes.

C. Appeals Reviews

Overview of Processes Being Changed. The Annual Appeals Review will now be referred to as the National Appeals Review (NAR). Beginning in 2017, the NAR will be held every triennially instead of annually. All reviews will be jointly coordinated by the National and ETA Regional Office appeals coordinators. The review team for the NAR will consist of at least one representative from each of the states administering the program and the appeals coordinator from each ETA Regional Office and the appeals

coordinator from the National Office. The re-engineered approach to the NAR will allow states to electronically transmit documents and recordings by uploading information to a secure Website. Sample sizes, as well as the subsampling process conducted by the National Office, will remain the same. During the other two years of the triennial cycle, the National and Regional Offices will coordinate to provide states training and other technical assistance. ETA is also considering potential changes to the review's scoring process and expects to engage states in considering those changes before finalizing a new approach.

Implementation Progress To Date. To date, the appeals sub-workgroup, which includes Federal and state members has completed the update of ET Handbook No. 382, *Handbook for Measuring UI Lower Authority Appeals Quality.* Proposals for training and implementation of the new handbook have also been developed.

Additional Implementation Steps and Timelines. ET Handbook No. 382 revisions are being finalized and we project release of the revised ET Handbook No. 382, 3rd Edition, Change 1, in the spring of 2016. Upon release of the handbook, ETA plans to schedule training webinars with the states to review changes and provide guidance on implementation of the changes.

D. BAM Reviews

Overview of Processes Being Changed. Beginning in FY 2015, the BAM Peer Review process has been changed to a three (3) year cycle for the evaluation of the state BAM program. Using a national approach for conducting the reviews, the BAM Peer Review process will provide for more uniformity in the review process and ensure that all the states are trained in a similar manner on the BAM procedures for coding and reporting. The triennial BAM review cycle is now as follows:

✓ BAM Peer Reviews will consist of two one-week reviews each year and will follow a three year cycle:
- Year 1 – One-half of the states will participate in both Paid Claims Reviews scheduled for the year;
- Year 2 – The other one-half of the states will participate in both Paid Claims Reviews scheduled for the year; and
- Year 3 – All states will participate in one of the two Denied Claims Reviews scheduled for the year, i.e., one-half of the states will attend the first review and the other one-half or remaining states will attend the second review.

✓ The Peer Reviews will be conducted during the second full week of March and the third full week of September each year.

✓ Ten cases per state will be reviewed during each of the Paid Claims Reviews (20 cases for the year for each participating state) and 15 cases per state will be reviewed for the Denied Claims Review.

Formal training on the peer review process will be provided for state BAM staff. Initial training will be conducted via webinar with additional instructions provided as part of the peer review.

The frequency of the Methods and Procedures (M&P) Reviews are being changed from a biennial to a triennial process with Regional Offices conducting these reviews for one-third of the states in their Region each year.

Implementation Progress to Date. The first national BAM Peer Review was held in Dallas, Texas during the week of February 23-27, 2015. The next national BAM Peer Review is scheduled for September 20-25, 2015, in Chicago, Illinois. ETA expects to provide states with meeting dates, times, and locations approximately three years in advance.

Additional Implementation Steps and Timelines. To address timeliness and quality of investigations, the BAM workgroup was tasked with developing criteria to assess the states' performance and to determine the additional monitoring and enhanced technical support that may be needed to assist states that are not meeting the established BAM program requirements. ETA plans to closely monitor state BAM performance in two broad areas – compliance with BAM program requirements and quality of paid and denied claim investigations. Technical assistance will be provided to states with challenges in either or both areas.

The BAM workgroup is in the process of updating ET Handbooks No. 396 and No. 395 to incorporate the changes outlined above and the revised handbooks are expected to be released in FY 2016.

E. **New Processes to Support Improved UI Benefit Operations.**

Overview of Processes Being Changed. As previously discussed above and in TEN No. 08-14, the efforts to reengineer the framework for UI program operations accountability builds on the TPS model and will include a new process for independent state self-assessments of operational practices for the various functional areas of benefit operations. One of the most important features in the framework is the design of a self-assessment tool to be used by states to evaluate their benefit operations and processes. Operational elements within major functional areas of UI benefits have been identified that require specific questions to be developed for the self-assessment tool. ETA has benefited from the input of state SMEs who serve as members of the team developing the self-assessment tool. ETA has also engaged a contractor with personnel that have significant state UI experience to assist in the development of the self-assessment tool.

Implementation Progress To Date. Since October of 2014, the team (composed of ETA staff, state SMEs, and contractor personnel) has been engaged in developing the self-assessment tool to be used by states in conducting assessments of their individual UI benefits program operations. The self-assessment tool will contain a series of in-depth

questions on functional areas within UI benefits operations. The team has developed sets of questions for the following fifteen functional areas within UI benefits: 1) Overarching Operational Matters; 2) Initial UI Claims Intake – Intrastate/Interstate; 3) Combined Wage Claims Intake; 4) Unemployment Compensation for Federal Employees Intake; 5) Unemployment Compensation for Ex-Servicemembers Intake; 6) Monetary Determinations; 7) Adjudications; 8) Continued Claims and Eligibility Reviews; 9) Appeals; 10) Benefit Payment Control; 11) Internal Security; 12) Disaster Unemployment Assistance; 13) Reemployment; 14) Data Validation; and 15) Short-Time Compensation.

Within each functional area the team has developed self-assessment questions that cover nine operational elements (where applicable for the specific functional area), including: 1) Procedures, Policies and Confidentiality; 2) Training; 3) Workload Analysis and Management Controls; 4) Performance Management; 5) Information Technology; 6) Customer Access and Communication; 7) Operational Efficiency and Resource Allocation; 8) Staffing and Merit Staffing; and 9) Fiscal Management.

Attached to this TEN is the Functional Operations chart that is guiding the development of the self-assessment questions. (See Attachment A.) It details the UI benefits functions and the categories of the operational elements for which draft self-assessment questions have been developed. Also, to help provide a better understanding of the self-assessment tool(s), a sample of a set of questions from the self-assessment tool is also attached to this TEN. (See Attachment B.) These questions are still in draft form and will go through additional review and pilot testing (discussed below); therefore, they should not in any way be considered a final product.

Additional Implementation Steps and Timelines. The Steering Committee governing this project determined that a pilot test should be conducted with selected states (between six and nine states) to test the sets of questions in the self-assessment tool. ETA is currently planning to conduct this pilot test during the first and second quarters of federal fiscal year (FY) 2016. Soon, ETA will be announcing a solicitation seeking states to volunteer to participate in the pilot test and will provide funding to the selected pilot states for this effort. ETA has also partnered with state subject matter experts (SMEs) to help develop proposed criteria for states to use in selecting staff or contractors to conduct the self-assessments. The recommended criteria will be shared with states prior to the pilot being launched. To further support this pilot test, ETA intends to develop a user guide and training material to be used in training the states on how to use the tool and how to validate the responses obtained during the self-assessment process.

Finally, ETA will gather feedback and comments from the pilot states on the use of the self-assessment tool, which will guide additional revisions and refinements prior to full scale implementation of the tool in FY 2017. Once all revisions are made, the final tool will be subject to public review and comment as required by the Office of Management and Budget's Paperwork Reduction Act process. This review and comment period is planned to occur in FY 2016.

F. Technical Assistance for "At Risk" States.

Overview of Processes Being Changed.   One of the tasks of this project has been the development of a new integrated process for identifying states that are determined to be "At Risk" and in need of intensive technical assistance. In the past, ETA developed separate definitions for states designated as "At Risk" and "high priority" states. The "At Risk" definition related to states that experienced significant challenges meeting certain acceptable levels of performance. See UIPL No. 22-10. The "high priority" definition related to states that experienced high rates of improper payments. See UIPL No. 33-11.

As noted above, state SMEs will be invited to participate as members of federal-state expert teams to provide technical assistance in the states that are determined to be in need of enhanced technical assistance. The expert teams will go on-site to assess the selected state's operational policies and procedures as well as customer service practices, identify issues and recommend performance improvement strategies and operational efficiencies. Use of state SMEs will help to inform recommended solutions and to provide advice and consultation to Federal staff in developing new approaches, alternatives and/or techniques to solve program related problems. As mentioned above in section 4(e), state SMEs were consulted in the development of proposed criteria for states to use in selecting state SMEs to participate on these expert teams.

Implementation Progress To Date.   The project team has developed a new single definition of "At Risk" that combines poor performance related to timeliness and quality and improper payment rates with information on states' operational issues that will be gleaned from the states' self-assessments described above, as well as information from other ETA Regional Office monitoring and/or technical assistance efforts. The objective for the "At Risk" designation will remain the same – to provide those states with the most current challenges related to program performance or administrative operational issues with intensive technical assistance to support improved performance. A diagram showing the elements that will compose the new "At Risk" designation in the future is attached to this TEN. (See Attachment C.)

Additional Implementation Steps and Timelines.   ETA intends to start using the new integrated definition of "at-risk" in identifying states for intensive technical assistance beginning in FY 2016, but initially without the information from the state self-assessment tool. The tool will not be implemented for initial use by all states until FY 2017. Therefore, FY 2018 will be the first year that the data from the state self-assessment tool will be available for use in determining a state's "At Risk" status.

6. **Action Requested.** State Administrators are requested to provide this information to their UI Directors, UI Benefit Managers, and other appropriate staff.

7. **Inquiries.** Inquiries should be directed to the appropriate ETA Regional Office.

8

8. **<u>Attachments</u>**.

    A. Operational Functions Chart
    B. Sample of Questions
    C. At-Risk Model

OPERATIONAL FUNCTIONS CHART

State: _____

Review Period: _____

Functional Areas	Operational Elements								
	Procedures, Policies and Confidentiality	Training	Workload Analysis/Management Controls	Performance Management	Information Technology	Customer Access and Communication	Operational Efficiency Resource Allocation	Staffing and Merit Staffing	Fiscal Management
Overarching Operational Matters (Program Wide)									
Intake – Regular UI, Intrastate and Interstate									
CWC									
UCFE									
UCX									
Monetary Determinations									
Adjudication/BTQ									
Continued Claims/Eligibility Review									
Appeals									
BPC									
Internal Security									
DUA									
Reemployment									
Data Validation									
STC									

V= All areas verified

R= Area of Risk, TBD

Cell Descriptors

Episodic

Not Applicable

** EXAMPLE **

Sample of questions in the "Procedures, Policies and Confidentiality" section of the "Adjudications and BTQ" functional area of Draft Self-Assessment Tool

Procedures, Policies and Confidentiality

Resources may include manuals, handbooks, desk aids, computer help screens, training guides, organized collections of procedures or policies, or other readily accessible instructions which can help staff do their work correctly, including ETA Handbook No. 301. Instructions will normally include general information such as compilations of relevant laws and regulations, as well as detailed instructions for carrying out individual jobs in the agency. Reviewers may need to look in many places to examine all relevant instructions.

1. Does the state have written policies and procedures for conducting fact-finding and adjudicating unemployment insurance claimant eligibility?

    1a. If yes, were the policies and procedures updated or modified during the review period?

2. How are policies and procedures for fact-finding and adjudicating issues made available to staff? (check all that apply)
    - Online instruction ☐
    - Hard-copy handbook ☐
    - Training materials ☐
    - Other _____ ☐

    2a. If policies and procedures are made available in multiple formats, are all formats consistent and up-to-date?

    2b. What practices does the state utilize to ensure all formats are consistent and up-to-date? ___
    _____
    _____

3. Have there been any law changes since the last review that affect the state's adjudications policies and procedures?

    3a. If yes, what law changes has the state implemented, when were they implemented and what was the effect on the state's adjudications policies and procedures? _____
    _____
    _____
    _____

    3b. Have the state's policies, procedures and training materials been updated to reflect these changes?

4. Have there been any significant organizational changes since the last review that affect the state's adjudications policies and procedures?

    4a. If yes, what organizational changes has the state implemented, when were these changes implemented and what was the effect on the state's adjudications policies and procedures? ____

    _____
    _____
    _____

    4b. Have the state's policies, procedures and training materials been updated to reflect these changes?

5. Has there been any automation or technology upgrades or releases since the last review that affect the state's adjudications policies and procedures?

    5a. If yes, what automation or technology upgrades has the state made? _____

    _____
    _____
    _____

    5b. When were the technology upgrades made and what was the effect of the change? _____

    _____
    _____

    5c. Have the state's policies, procedures and training materials been updated to reflect these changes?

6. Does the state utilize any automation in its fact-finding processes?

    6a. If yes, what automated fact-finding processes are available to collect claimant information without staff intervention? _____

    _____
    _____

    6b. What automated fact-finding processes are available to collect employer information without staff intervention? _____

    _____
    _____

    6c. What automated fact-finding processes are available for staff to use to collect claimant or employer information? _____

    _____
    _____

7. Do the state's policies and procedures for fact-finding include guidance regarding rebuttal opportunity to a claimant or employer when there is a controversy in the information provided?

7a. If yes, are the automated processes described above available for the rebuttal process?

7a. If the state uses other automated processes to obtain rebuttals, describe. _____
_____

8. Provide the following adjudications workload data during the review period for the following categories:

	Separation	Non-separation
• Issues Created	_____	_____
• Issues Adjudicated	_____	_____

9. Does the state use the State Information Data Exchange System (SIDES) Web Services and SIDES E-Response to exchange claim information with employers and their representatives in support of the adjudications process?

10. Do the state's policies and procedures provide guidance for investigating and adjudicating the following separation issues? (check all that apply)
   - Voluntary Quits ☐
   - Discharge for Misconduct ☐
   - Gross Misconduct ☐
   - Leave of Absence ☐
   - Other (explain) _____ ☐
   _____

11. Do the state's policies and procedures provide guidance for investigating and adjudicating the following non-separation issues? (check all that apply)
   - Able and Available ☐
   - Alien worker, authorization for employment ☐
   - Athlete – reasonable assurance - between seasons ☐
   - Claim timeliness – backdating of initial claims and untimely filed continued claims ☐
   - Disqualifying/deductible income – Vacation pay, Holiday pay, Pension ☐
   - Failure to participate in the Reemployment and Eligibility Assessment program ☐
   - Failure to participate in Worker Profiling and Reemployment Services ☐
   - Fraud Administrative Penalty ☐
   - Job Service/Employment Service Registration ☐
   - Multi-claimant: Labor Dispute ☐
   - Refusal of suitable work ☐
   - Removal of Disqualification, when a controversy exists ☐
   - Reporting requirements ☐
   - School Employee – reasonable assurance – between or within terms ☐
   - School/Approved training ☐
   - Seasonality - wages earned during specified periods of time are not useable ☐
   - Unemployment Status – Work or remuneration sufficient to be "not unemployed" ☐
   - Work search requirements ☐

12. Do the state's policies and procedures require written determinations contain the following information? (check all that apply)

- The reason for the disqualification or ineligibility ☐
- Applicable requalification requirements ☐
- An explanation of the appeal rights and timeframe for filing a timely appeal ☐

12a. If an employer submits potentially disqualifying information after the last day for providing a timely response, how is this matter handled? _____
_____
_____

13. Do the state's policies and procedures define the detection date of an issue in accordance with ETA Handbook No. 301?

    13a. Is the issue detection date input into the system manually or is it created automatically?
- Automatic ☐
- Manual ☐

    13b. If automatic, is the system following the proper policies and procedures to define the detection date?

14. Do the state's policies and procedures define the standard for a "reasonable attempt" to obtain information by phone deemed to be critical to the outcome of a determination to be forty-eight (48) hours from the time of the request?

15. Do the state's policies and procedures correctly define a determination for reporting purposes using the following criteria in accordance with ETA Handbook No. 401? (check all that apply)
- A decision which has the potential to affect the claimant's past, present or future benefit rights and for which a determination of eligibility was made ☐
- Determinations made because of misrepresentation, fraud, and/or overpayments ☐
- A claimant's separation for a reason "other than lack of work" that results in a nonmonetary determination ☐
- If controversy exists about whether the claimant satisfies the conditions of an indefinite disqualification (i.e., until re-employed for a specific period or has earned a specific sum of money) that results in a nonmonetary determination ☐
- Investigation of a claimant's explanation for late reporting or failure to report as directed that results in a nonmonetary determination ☐

16. Are the following determinations defined as being not reportable in accordance with ETA Handbook No. 401? (check all that apply)
- Determination, relative to issues, made solely for deciding whether charges should be made to an employer's experience-rating account ☐
- Routine exploration of fact or questioning claimants associated with the claims taking process except under circumstances of controversy ☐
- Claimant's acceptance of the claims taker's conclusion that the week's earnings require a reduction in the benefit amount for that week ☐
- Claimant's acceptance of benefits for only a portion of a week claimed, when the state law provides for reduced benefits in cases where the claimant was ill or otherwise unavailable for work during part of the week ☐

4

- A determination on whether or not a stated period of time elapsed since a disqualifying act, satisfying the disqualification, which is part of the function of taking claims ☐
- A determination on whether or not the claimant meets the minimum wage and employment qualifying requirement to establish a benefit year ☐
- Determinations on the existence of and/or number of dependents ☐
- A determination on whether the claimant meets state requirements for establishing a subsequent benefit year (e.g., 30 days of bona fide work since exhausting a benefit series) ☐

17. Does the state have policies and procedures for adjudicating issues for Extended Benefits claims or for claims under any temporary federal additional or extended benefit program in effect during the review period?

    17a. If yes, when were the policies and procedures last updated? _____

18. Does the state have procedures to inform claimants that confidential information provided for the unemployment compensation claim may be requested and utilized for other governmental purposes, including verification of eligibility under other governmental programs, in accordance with 20 CFR 603.11?

    18a. If yes, how is this information provided to the claimant? _____
    _____

    18b. When is this information provided to the claimant? _____
    _____
    _____

19. Does the state have procedures to inform employers that wage information and other confidential information provided relating to an unemployment compensation claim may be requested and utilized for other governmental purposes, including verification of an individual's eligibility for other governmental programs in accordance with 20 CFR 603.11?

    19a. If yes, how is this information provided to employers? _____
    _____

    19b. When is this information provided to the employer? _____
    _____
    _____

Comments:

Document any issues detected in adjudications that adversely affected the state's performance during the review period or that may affect future performance and the state's ability to meet the UI Performs Core Measures standards; to effectively administer fact finding and adjudications; or that affects customer service.

_____
_____

_____
_____
_____
_____
_____

Consider the state's strengths and weaknesses in managing its policies, procedures and confidentiality practices related to the adjudications and BTQ processes that have been identified through this review.

_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____

At-Risk Model

1 Results from the state self-assessment tool

2 Core Measures

3 Improper Payment measure

4 Empirical ranking of states

5 Regional/National Office Intel

At-Risk States