Unemployment Insurance (UI) Benefit Operations Self-Assessment Tool:

Worker Profiling and Reemployment Services (WPRS) and Reemployment Services and Eligibility Assessment (RESEA)

This self-assessment review of the state's Worker Profiling and Reemployment Services (WPRS) and Reemployment Services and Eligibility Assessment (RESEA) functional areas will examine operational processes as well as program performance. The reviewer will consult with appropriate staff regarding each operational element, as necessary, to ensure accurate and complete information is reported. This will include Unemployment Insurance (UI) administrators, IT managers, fiscal officers, and America's Job Center staff, if needed.

The reviewer will provide information regarding the state's performance in regards to the Facilitate Reemployment measure. Use this link for more information regarding UI PERFORMS ALPs/Performance Criteria: Acceptable Level of Performance. WPRS and RESEA workload data will also be provided.

Upon completion of this review, the results should be shared with UI administrators and appropriate managers and staff. The self-assessment findings can provide a very good analysis of the state's WPRS and RESEA program operations and can be used to drive process and program-improvement initiatives.

A comments section is provided for each operational element, which the reviewer should use to document any observations regarding issues identified related to that specific operational element. This space may also be used to provide any additional information relating to a specific question in this section. In doing so, the reviewer should reference the specific question by number and insert the additional information related to that question.

In addition, a concluding comments section is provided at the end of the self-assessment instrument to capture any strengths identified by the reviewer in this functional area which could constitute a successful practice(s) to be shared with other states; any issues identified by the reviewer in the functional area that adversely impacts the state's performance and to identify any possible corrective actions to address the issue; and general comments about this functional area that are not covered elsewhere. The reviewer can provide information here that Federal reviewers and state UI administrators and managers can use to assess program operations and the state's effectiveness in providing quality services in this functional area.

Save your entries regularly as you complete the review and when you close the self-assessment to ensure your answers are saved.

SECTION 1: Procedures, Policies, and Confidentiality

The purpose of this section is to review the policies and procedures provided by the agency for staff to use in operating this functional area of the UI program. These are the written (in hard-copy, electronically, or both formats) standards, instructions, and guidelines that staff regularly use in the operation of the program. The reviewer may utilize resources that 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. 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 and consult with UI administrators, office/call center managers, the IT manager and Labor Market Information manager.

The reviewer will document whether the state has policies and procedures sufficient to provide guidance and instruction to staff responsible for providing WPRS and RESEA services to UI claimants. Existing policies and procedures should be examined to determine whether they are up-to-date and address all law changes, organizational changes and technology changes that occurred during the review period.

> **Helpful Info.**
>
> *Question 2b:* If the state has not implemented the RESEA program, the reviewer should consult with the UI manager to obtain information regarding the state's intention to implement RESEA and, if so, the timeline for doing so.
>
> *Question 8:* The reviewer should consult with the UI manager, the Labor Market Information manager, and/or the IT manager for information concerning the type of model the state uses for the WPRS and/or RESEA program to determine a claimant's likelihood to exhaust UI benefits.
>
> *Question 9:* The reviewer should consult with the UI manager, the Labor Market manager, and/or the IT manager for information concerning the claimant and labor market demographics that the state uses for the WPRS and/or RESEA program to determine a claimant's likelihood to exhaust UI benefits.
>
> *Question 10a:* The reviewer will document whether the state regularly reviews the profiling model to assess its effectiveness. If not, the UI administrator may wish to implement a review process to ensure the state's model remains up-to-date and effective.

Helpful Info. (*continued*)

Question 11a: The reviewer should consult with the UI manager, the Labor Market manager and/or the IT manager for information concerning any changes that have been made to the state's profiling model and the reason for these changes.

Question 15b: The reviewer will document the methods used by staff that conduct eligibility reviews and deliver reemployment services to notify UI of eligibility and separation issues that are discovered delivering WPRS and RESEA services.

Question 17: The reviewer will document all the components the state includes in its initial RESEA. The term 'American Job Center (AJC) when used in this and other questions refers to a public workforce one-stop center operated in the state.

Question 18: The reviewer will document all the components the state includes in its subsequent RESEA.

Question 23: The reviewer will identify all organizations/service providers that deliver WPRS and RESEA services. "Service provider" includes those organizations that provide the first level or basic WPRS and RESEA services – assessment, orientation, etc. It would not include schools or other organizations to which they may refer claimants for training or intensive services.

Question 25: The reviewer should review UIPL No. 13 - 15 to acquaint themselves with requirements for the memorandum of understanding between the UI agency and all service providers for RESEA.

Question 26: The reviewer will identify all types of staff that deliver WPRS and RESEA services in the state, including other state agencies and third party providers, if applicable.

Question 30: The reviewer should consult with the UI managers to determine whether the UI staff meets regularly with the WPRS and RESEA service providers to negotiate program expectations, facilitate cooperation between all parties, and resolve issues as they arise. This practice is critical to the successful operation of these programs.

SECTION 2: Training

Managers/employees should possess and maintain a level of expertise which enables them to accomplish their assigned duties. Training systems should be sufficient to ensure that personnel understand and perform their duties properly. When reviewing training systems, the reviewer should consult with the state's training unit/staff and examine formal training procedures (e.g., the training is conducted using an established schedule and using set guidelines to make judgments about the quality of work being produced). The state should have procedures for identifying general and specific training needs, for developing a training curriculum and training materials, and for delivering training as needs are identified. If WPRS and RESEA services are provided by non-UI staff, provisions must be made to ensure they are adequately trained to identify potential issues that may affect the claimant's eligibility for unemployment benefits.

> **Helpful Info.**
>
> *Question 1b:* The reviewer should consult with the UI manager regarding the steps UI has taken to ensure that WPRS and RESEA providers have policies and procedures in place to provide program training to their staff. This may be a topic the state would wish to include in the MOU with their service providers.
>
> *Question 5:* The reviewer should document all policy or operational changes that were implemented during the review period that affected WPRS and RESEA processes.
>
> *Question 6:* The reviewer should document all law changes or program implementations that have occurred during the review period that affect WPRS and RESEA processes.

SECTION 3: Workload Analysis/Management Controls

The reviewer will examine state's ability to manage WPRS and RESEA workloads, particularly through periods of unforeseen spikes in workload; and the state's ability to provide timely, quality services. The reviewer will document process-improvement initiatives aimed at improving service delivery or increasing the number of claimants that can be served. The reviewer will interview appropriate staff and managers and performance management staff to thoroughly document the state's practices for managing its WPRS and RESEA workloads.

Helpful Info.

Question 2: The reviewer should consult with the UI managers to document any action that is taken by UI if service providers are not meeting agreed-upon service levels for number of claimants served.

Question 4a: If WPRS and RESEA service providers were unable to provide agreed-upon services, the reviewer will document the reason(s) for their failure to do so.

Question 5a: Describe all business process analysis initiatives the state conducted during the review period regarding its WPRS processes, and what operational changes have been implemented as a result of those initiatives.

Question 6a: Describe all business process analysis initiatives the state conducted during the review period regarding its RESEA processes and what operational changes have been implemented as a result of those initiatives.

SECTION 4: Performance Management

The reviewer will examine the state's practices for monitoring program performance and compliance with Federal and state law and regulations. Review the state's practices for the preparation and monitoring of corrective action plans to ensure timely and accurate submittal of reports and methods for continued monitoring of program performance in relation to designated milestones. If the state has a performance management unit, the reviewer should consult with performance management staff in addition to UI administrators and office/call center managers when completing this section.

Helpful Info.

Question 1a: The reviewer should consult with UI managers for information regarding any Corrective Action Plan that the state's State Quality Service Plan (SQSP) contained during the review period for the Facilitate Reemployment measure.

Question 1b: The reviewer will report whether the state met designated milestones on its SQSP during any quarter(s) during the review period for the Facilitate Reemployment measure.

Helpful Info. (*continued*)

Question 1c: If the state has submitted multi-year CAP(s), the reviewer will document progress made in meeting designated milestones based upon information obtained from UI management.

Question 2a: The reviewer should document any programs or initiatives the state has implemented that are focused on improving WPRS and RESEA program performance and service delivery.

Question 3a: The reviewer will document the methods the state uses to monitor its WPRS and RESEA operations. If the state's processes for monitoring these programs are considered to be particularly effective and/or efficient, explain fully in the Comments area at the end of this section.

SECTION 5: Information Technology (IT)

When completing this section of the self-assessment the reviewer should consult with UI and IT administrators and office/call center managers. IT projects relating to WPRS and RESEA that were completed during the review period or are on-going will be detailed. The reviewer will assess the state IT department's delivery of programming and technical support to the WPRS and RESEA functional areas.

Helpful Info.

Question 1a: The reviewer should describe any major IT projects that were conducted during the review period that impacted the WPRS and RESEA programs and provide information regarding the project status, and if completed, the success of the project.

Question 3a: If the state had IT needs related to its WPRS and RESEA programs that were not met, the reviewer should document the needs that were not met and the impact it had on those programs' operations, if any.

Question 4a: If the UI agency and the WPRS and RESEA service providers operate separate computer systems, the reviewer will document any issues that the state must mitigate to ensure it is able to transmit and receive program data.

Question 6a: The reviewer will document which office/unit is responsible for generating required reports for the WPRS and RESEA programs.

SECTION 6: Claimant Access & Communication

The reviewer will examine the state's methods for providing reemployment service. Methods used must comply with requirements set forth in Federal law. The reviewer will consult with UI administrators and appropriate managers and staff when completing this section of the self-assessment.

> **Helpful Info.**
>
> *Question 1:* The reviewer will document all methods the state uses to provide each of the WPRS and RESEA services listed. If a listed service is not provided, leave the responses blank for that service.
>
> *Question 2:* The reviewer will document all services provided during initial and subsequent RESEA appointments. If a listed service is not provided, leave the responses blank for that service.

SECTION 7: Operational Efficiency / Resource Allocation

Through interviews with UI administrators and appropriate managers and staff the reviewer will identify efficiencies and automation the state has used to improve operations and provide better service to the public.

> **Helpful Info.**
>
> *Question 2:* The reviewer will document any automated processes related to its WPRS program that the state implemented to improve program efficiency during the review period. If the state's automated processes are considered to be particularly effective and/or efficient, explain fully in the Comments area at the end of this section.
>
> *Question 3:* The reviewer will document any automated processes the state implemented during the review period related to its RESEA program to improve program efficiency. If the state's automated processes are considered to be particularly effective and/or efficient, explain fully in the Comments area at the end of this section.

SECTION 8: Staffing/ Merit Staffing

The reviewer will examine organizational changes that occurred during the review period, if any, and their effect on the state's ability to manage its WPRS and RESEA programs and to meet Federal reemployment measures. The reviewer should consult with UI administrators, office/call center managers and the state agency's human resource manager when completing this section of the self-assessment. The appropriate use of merit and non-merit staff is also reviewed in this section.

> **Helpful Info.**
>
> *Question 1:* Staffing allocations are examined to determine whether WPRS and RESEA operations are adequately staffed, based upon state size and FTE allocations.
>
> *Question 2a:* The reviewer may consult with the agency's Human Resources department or the U.S. Department of Labor Regional Office for information regarding merit staff regulations.
>
> *Question 3:* The number of FTEs dedicated to the WPRS and RESEA programs impact the state's ability to meet Federal requirements for the Facilitate Reemployment measure.

SECTION 9: Concluding Summary Comments

The reviewer will use the Concluding Summary Comments section to highlight the state's strengths and weaknesses that impact the WPRS and RESEA functional areas and to identify issues that have not been addressed in any other section of the self-assessment. These comments are intended to provide Federal reviewers and the state's UI administrators with additional insight into these program areas, focusing on methods that have proven to be successful and can be capitalized upon or areas where corrective measures may be needed.

The first comment area provides the reviewer an opportunity to share any examples of good and/or exemplary operations in this functional area after reviewing each operational element. The reviewer can use this space to identify any policy, procedure or operation that would constitute a successful practice that can be shared with other states.

The second comment area provides the reviewer to document issues detected during the review that are having an adverse impact on the functional area, affecting the state's performance, ability to meet performance standards or customer service. It is also a place to recommend corrective actions for the agency's leadership to consider implementing.

The final comment area in this section provides the reviewer space to share any additional comments, concerns or observations regarding the state's operations in this functional area.