

Unemployment Insurance Lower Authority Appeals IT Assessment

Vendors Webinar/Teleconference, April 25th, 2012 2:00 P.M.

Definitions

Time Lapse (20CFR650) is a measure of how long it took to decide a case; how timely a hearing is held and the written decision rendered.

The time lapse Acceptable Level of Performance (ALP) for Lower Authority Appeals is:

- 60 percent of completed cases within 30 days, and
- 80 percent of completed cases within 45 days.

20CFR650 - Code of Federal Regulations (CFR), Title 20 Employees' Benefits, Chapter V Employment and Training Administration, Department of Labor, Part 650 – Standard for Appeals Promptness – Unemployment Compensation

- 650.1 Nature and purpose of the standard - Sections 303(a) (1) and (3) of the Social Security Act require, as a condition for the receipt of granted funds, that State laws include provisions for methods of administration reasonably calculated to insure full payment of unemployment compensation when due, and opportunity for a fair hearing for all individuals whose claims for unemployment compensation are denied. The Secretary has construed these provisions to require, as a condition for receipt of granted funds, that State laws include provisions for hearing and deciding appeals for all unemployment insurance claimants who are parties to an administrative benefit appeal with the greatest promptness that is administratively feasible.
- 650.2 Federal law requirements
- 650.3 Secretary's interpretation of Federal law requirements
- 650.5 Annual appeals performance plan

Case Aging (UIPL 14-05, Change 3) is a measure of how old cases are that have not been decided; on average, how many cases are still waiting (in days) for a hearing and a written decision.

The ALP for case aging is:

- 30 days – meaning cases should not be pending for more than 30 days for lower authority appeals; and
- 40 days – meanings cases should not be pending for more than 40 days for higher authority appeals. There are five states that do not have a second stage (higher authority appeals) for UI; they are: DC, HI, MN, NE, and VI.

Lower Authority Quality (ET Handbook 382) is a measure of whether a "fair hearing" was provided. The quarterly and annual reviews measure whether a state's lower authority appellate process is fair to all interested parties.

The ALP is:

- 80 percent of cases reviewed should have a quality score of 85 percent or higher.

State UI Management Information Measures for Appeals (UIPL 21-04) no corrective action plan needed for SQSP if not achieving measure.

- LAA Timeliness: 95 percent of completed cases within 90 days.

Unemployment Insurance Lower Authority Appeals IT Assessment

Vendors Webinar/Teleconference, April 25th, 2012 2:00 P.M.

Vendor Questions & Answers

Is “Assessment Tool” used interchangeably with “Assessment Report”?

No. Assessment tool is meant to describe the tool that might be used to gather information or to conduct the assessment, not a particular set of software. The Assessment Report is just that, a final written report.

What is the difference between the Assessment Report and the Final Report?

Assessment Report, a report of vendor’s activities and findings, is to be provided at the end of Phase 1. Final Report, a report of best ways to go about providing technical assistance and training to the states and how to carry it out based on the results of Phase 1, is to be provided at the end of Phase 2.

Could ITSC elaborate on the scope of Phase 2 and the training delivery? What kind of training?

The focus of this RFP is on Phase 1. ITSC has fewer resources available for Phase 2 and is looking for a generalized approach of how the vendors would proceed.

What is ITSC’s staffing prospects?

ITSC will provide project oversight to the project and work with the vendor to answer any questions or resolve issues but ITSC only has minimal staff hours committed to this project including the review of deliverables. Some state subject matter experts will work with the vendor, which will mostly provide content expertise, not hours. The project largely relies on the vendor.

Where can the project management plan be accessed? Is ITSC looking for a detailed report?

ITSC will provide the schedule outline and the project management plan http://itsc.org/ITSC_Project_Management_Template_Schedule.pdf that it would like the vendor to follow. ITSC would like details on the project management plan; i.e. input and details on how it will be implemented.

Are the current T&TA (Training and Technical Assistance) practices being implemented by ITSC?

Not relevant to this project

Does ITSC have a rough order of magnitude estimate or budget for the spending on both phases?

No set number. ITSC would like the vendors’ best estimate.

Will ITSC provide performance metrics to the vendor? APLs by states, handbooks...

ITSC will provide more information when the contract is awarded to the successful vendor.

Unemployment Insurance Lower Authority Appeals IT Assessment

Vendors Webinar/Teleconference, April 25th, 2012 2:00 P.M.

Are the system tools to be process centric, resource centric, or systems (tools) centric?

ITSC would like to look at the whole process and the IT components

What are the specific responsibilities of the contractor, in terms of providing T&TA?

ITSC would like to see general scope of how the vendor would approach it going forward.

What is the anticipated project start date?

It is anticipated to start early to middle August. See schedule posted on ITSC Website.

Will ITSC and/or ETA provide a list of the contact person in each state for this project?

Yes

Will ETA notify the states as to the purpose of the project and ask for their cooperation?

Yes

Does ITSC anticipate ETA to provide a UIPL to set the scope and expectations of this project?

No. ETA or ITSC will make the contacts and introductions for the vendor.

Are the staff resumes included in the 10 page limit of the Project Management/Proposed Staffing?

No

Will OMB's approval be necessary in order for the vendor to contact 53 states?

No

Page 2 of the RFP discusses the scope relative to states that utilize a "panel" system. Please provide a more specific description of the panel system and also what the requirements and deliverables are for non-UI functions that utilize the panel. Should these be addressed relative to their disposition in final recommendations?

Some states have a combined appeals process in that they (the panel) review appeals from a number of other state programs. In the case where a state has a panel in place their function with respect to UI would need to be assessed. To the extent that the panel process causes issues with the UI appeals process either positive or negative, that should be captured as part of the assessment.

Unemployment Insurance Lower Authority Appeals IT Assessment

Vendors Webinar/Teleconference, April 25th, 2012 2:00 P.M.

Reference Links

ETA Handbook No. 382, 2nd Edition, handbook for measuring UI lower authority appeals quality.
http://wdr.doleta.gov/directives/corr_doc.cfm?DOCN=2289

ET Handbook No. 401, primarily pertaining to the 5130, 9054, and 9055 reports.
http://wdr.doleta.gov/directives/ETA_Handbook.cfm

ET Handbook No. 402, primarily pertaining to the 5130, 9054, and 9055 reports.
http://wdr.doleta.gov/directives/ETA_Handbook.cfm

State UI Performance

<http://workforcesecurity.doleta.gov/unemploy/performance.asp>

State Ranking of Core Measures

<http://www.ows.doleta.gov/unemploy/ranking.asp>

Benefits: Timeliness and Quality Reports, pertaining to LAA timelapse, case aging, and LAA quality

<http://workforcesecurity.doleta.gov/unemploy/btq.asp>

UI PERFORMS PY 2006 Annual Report

http://workforcesecurity.doleta.gov/unemploy/pdf/ar_05.pdf

Unemployment Insurance Lower Authority Appeals IT Assessment

Vendors Webinar/Teleconference, April 25th, 2012 2:00 P.M.

Vendor Participant List

Name	Email	Company
Allan Toubman	aatoubman@msn.com	Administrative Justice Institute
Gary Soucy	gsoucy@berrydunn.com	BerryDunn
Lester Coffey	lcoffey@coffeyconsultingllc.com	Coffey Consulting, LLC
Jim Mahony	jmahony@csgdelivers.com	CSG
Mike Sheridan	mike@mscaustin.com	Gartner
Abigail Knox	aknox@iag.biz	IAG Consulting
Mike Stokes	mike@innovateforward.com	Innovate Forward Inc.
Dominic Pavese	dppavese@aol.com	Maher & Maher
Fred Homan	fred@fmhcs.com	Maher & Maher
Linda Lawson	llawson@mahernet.com	Maher & Maher
Robbi Ruben-Urm	rruben-urm@mathematica-mpr.com	Mathematica Policy Research
Raj Sridar	raj@radhaconsulting.com	Radha Consulting
Sumit Sabharwal	sumit@radhaconsulting.com	Radha Consulting
Jim May	jmay@windsorsw.com	Windsor Software