

THE UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE (UI) REEMPLOYMENT AND ELIGIBILITY ASSESSMENT (REA) DATA CONCERNS

The list below has been developed to help states in reviewing their Employment and Training Administration (ETA) UI REA 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 UI REA data. States should use the spreadsheets and the list below to assess whether they have 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 UI REA grants for Fiscal Year 2014. States must describe their plans to implement corrections and include a projected timeline for completion in the supplemental budget request.

The Department has added a new guideline this year addressing the outcomes of claimants scheduled for an REA. States should account for 100 percent of the scheduled and rescheduled REAs on the ETA 9128. 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 an REA may participate in the REA or fail to participate. If the claimant fails to participate in the scheduled REA, the claimant may or may not be disqualified depending on why the claimant failed to participate and how the issue was addressed by the state. Claimants who have returned to work are not disqualified. Claimants who could not report due to a job interview are also not disqualified. States are 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 REA, states are required to adjudicate the claimant's eligibility. It is not required that the claimant be rescheduled. The number of claimants scheduled for an REA must be equal to the number of claimants who completed a UI REA and the number of claimants who failed to complete a UI REA. If this total is not 100 percent of the scheduled REAs, the state should examine the population that is not explained by the data. Since the UI REA may be scheduled in one quarter and the claimant may report or fail to report in a subsequent quarter, these percentages should average out over multiple calendar quarters.

ETA 9128 UI REA Workloads Report

A. UI REAs Scheduled (Item 2)

This number should be compared to the number of UI REAs for which the state received funding. States should be scheduling quarterly UI REAs at a sufficient level to ensure that they will reach their funded level at the end of the year.

UI REAs Scheduled should be approximately the sum of Item 3 *UI REAs 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 REAs 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 REAs 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 REAs completed it is possible that the state is counting disqualifications or overpayments that are not a part of the UI REA. Both disqualifications and overpayments must be based on issues that were discovered as a result of the UI REA.

D. Separation Issues (Item 8)

If this number is large compared to the number of UI REAs completed, it is possible that the state is counting disqualifications that are not a part of the UI REA. 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 REAs 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 REA should 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 both 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 UI REA Outcomes Report

The number of claimants who established a UI benefit year in the report quarter is provided for the Comparison Group in Item 1a and for the UI REA group in Item 2a. The number in Item 1a should not be less than 10 percent of the number in Item 2a, as the comparison group must, at a minimum, be 10 percent of the UI REA treatment group to provide a reasonable measurement.

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 for the Comparison Group and in items 2a and 2b for the UI REA Treatment Group. 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 for the Comparison Group and in items 2a and 2e for the UI REA Treatment Group. 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. If the difference of the average duration between the Comparison Group and the UI REA Treatment Group is two weeks or greater, there may be programming problems.

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.