Supporting Statement B

Collection of Information Employing Statistical Methods

1. Describe (including a numerical estimate) the potential respondent universe and any sampling or other respondent selection methods to be used. Data on the number of entities (e.g., establishments, State and local government units, households, or persons) in the universe covered by the collection and in the corresponding sample are to be provided in tabular form for the universe as a whole and for each of the strata in the proposed sample. Indicate expected response rates for the collection as a whole. If the collection had been conducted previously, include the actual response rate achieved during the last collection.

a. Respondent Universe. The respondent universe for paid and denied claims comprises fifty-two State Workforce Agencies (SWAs), claimants, employers, and third parties. Within each SWA, the universe for paid claims is defined as all intrastate and interstate weeks paid (or offset) in the State Unemployment Insurance (UI), Unemployment Compensation for Federal Employees (UCFE), and Unemployment Compensation for Ex-servicemembers (UCX) programs. For denied claims, each SWA defines three universes of formal, documented denial decisions or determinations of ineligibility for benefits. These denial decisions are based on (a) monetary issues; (b) separation issues; and (c) nonseparation, or "continuing eligibility" issues.

b. Sampling Methodology.

BAM Paid Claims

SWAs select systematic random samples of paid UI claims each week and use the results of the BAM paid claims investigations to estimate accurately the number and dollar value of proper and improper payments (overpayments and underpayments), and their rates of occurrence. BAM paid claims also provides information that can be used for program improvement, including the type of payment error, error cause, responsible party, point of detection within the system, and the actions of claimants, employers, and agencies prior to the BAM investigation.

The Department has supplied each SWA with software that performs quality assurance edits of the sampling frames and randomly selects the BAM paid claims samples. Each week a random sample is selected of both intrastate and interstate original payments (including combined wage claims) made for a week of unemployment under the State UI, UCX or UCFE programs. A minimum sample of 360 cases per year is pulled in the ten states with the smallest UI program workloads (defined as average annual UI weeks paid during the most recent five calendar years) and a minimum sample of 480 cases per year in the other states. State BAM staff audit each selected claim, examining all aspects of a claimant's eligibility to receive unemployment compensation during the sampled week. In their investigation, staff verify wages used to establish monetary entitlements, the claimant's reason for being unemployed, efforts to find work during the week and any other factors which would have affected the claimant's entitlement to a benefit during the sampled week or the amount of the benefit paid. Effective January 2008, paid claims selected for BAM must be matched with the National Directory of New Hires. The findings are then coded and entered into a database that is maintained on a computer located in each SWA. The Department uploads state BAM results (minus claimant Social Security Number) to a database maintained by the ETA Office of Unemployment

Insurance. The Department publishes annual performance results and uses the data for various analytical and evaluative purposes.

BAM Denied Claims

Each week, SWAs select systematic random samples from the three separate sampling frames constructed from the universes of claims for UI for which eligibility was denied for monetary, separation, or nonseparation reasons. Samples are selected using the same sampling frame edit and sample selection software used for paid claims. The Department estimates the accuracy of decisions to deny claimants UI, based on the results of the case investigations for these samples.

Investigation of BAM denied claims follows the paid claims case investigation methodology. It evaluates denials accuracy by investigating random samples of each of the three types of denials. All states sample a minimum of 150 cases of each type of denial in each calendar year. State BAM staff review agency records and contact claimants, employers, and all other relevant parties to verify information in agency records or obtain additional information pertinent to the determination that denies eligibility. Unlike the investigation of paid claims, in which all prior determinations affecting claimant eligibility for the compensated week selected for the sample are evaluated, the investigation of denied claims is limited to the issue upon which the denial determination is based.

The Department distributes a table of random start numbers to use with the BAM paid and denied claims sample selection software. A separate random number is provided for each sample pull (paid claims, monetary denials, separation denials, nonseparation denials) for each of the 52 weekly samples.

Scope: Both paid and denied intrastate and interstate claims in the State UI, UCFE, and UCX programs are included in the sampling frames. Paid and denied interstate claims are included in the sampling frames of the interstate liable state. The “liable” state is the state which pays the UI benefits (that is, that state’s Unemployment Trust Fund is charged). The “agent” state is the state that processes the UI claim.

Operational Definitions of Sampling Frames: Unless otherwise stated, definitions refer to those used in ET Handbook 401, 5th edition. ETA report cell references are those used in ET Handbook 402, 5th edition.

(1) Paid Weeks

Include only paid or compensated weeks that fall into all of the following: a) regular program type (UI, UCFE, UCX, or any combination thereof), b) weeks for which the payments/offsets are original payments (defined as the first valid payment/offset made by a state agency to a claimant for that week; offsets would normally recover overpayments established for previous weeks), c) weeks for which “total” or “part-total” payments/offsets are made, and d) weeks for which payments/offsets/intercepted payments are made to intrastate claimants, to interstate claimants by the liable state, or for combined wage claims.

Exclude weeks that all waiting weeks, weeks for which supplemental payments are made, weeks with stop payments, and all weeks paid under the Short Time Compensation (STC) [Workshare], Extended Benefits (EB), Trade Readjustment

Allowance (TRA), Disaster Unemployment Assistance (DUA) programs, any temporary Federal-State supplemental compensation programs, or other special programs, such as Emergency Unemployment Compensation.

(2) Monetary Denials

Include all initial claims that meet the definition for inclusion in the ETA 5159 Claims and Activities report on lines 101 (State UI), 102 (UCFE, No UI), and 103 (UCX only), for item 2 (new intrastate, excluding transitional), item 6 (transitional), and item 7 (interstate received as liable state) and for which eligibility was denied because of:

- Insufficient wages,
- Insufficient hours/weeks/days,
- Failure of high quarter wage test,
- Requalification wage requirement, or
- Other state monetary eligibility requirement

Exclude denied claims made under the Short Time Compensation (STC) (Workshare), Extended Benefits (EB), Trade Readjustment Allowance (TRA), Disaster Unemployment Assistance (DUA), or any temporary Federal-State supplemental compensation programs.

(3) Separation Denials

Include all separation determinations that meet the definition for inclusion in the ETA 9052 Nonmonetary Determinations Time Lapse (Detection Date) report in cells c1 (intrastate), c5 (interstate), and c193 (multi-claimant) and for which eligibility was denied based on any of the following issues:

- Voluntary quit (either personal or work connected),
- Discharge,
- Labor dispute, or
- Other separation issue reportable under definitions in ET Handbook 401

Exclude denied claims made under the STC, EB, TRA, DUA, or any temporary Federal-State supplemental compensation programs.

(4) Nonmonetary-Nonseparation Denials

Include all nonmonetary-nonseparation determinations that meet the definition for inclusion in the ETA 9052 Nonmonetary Determinations Time Lapse (Detection Date) report in cells c97 (intrastate), c101 (interstate), and c193 (multiclaimant) and for which eligibility was denied based on any of the following issues:

- Able and/or available to work,
- Actively seeking work,
- Disqualifying/unreported income,
- Refusal of suitable work or offer of job referral,

- Refusal of referral to profiling services,
- Failure to report,
- Failure to register with the employment service, or
- Other nonseparation eligibility issue (for example, alien status, athlete, school employee, seasonality, removal of disqualification, and determination of whether claimant's activities or status constitutes service or employment).

Exclude denied claims made under the STC, EB, TRA, DUA, or any temporary Federal-State supplemental compensation programs.

Frequency and Timing:

SWAs create a sampling frame file each week for all four universes. For paid claims, the survey population is selected from all weeks for which payments are made or offsets applied during a period that begins at 12:00 a.m. on Sunday and ends at 11:59 p.m. on Saturday. This interval is defined by the run time(s) of the computer programs that issue the checks or apply offsets.

The sampling frame for separation and nonseparation denied claims includes all decisions to deny UI claims issued during the period 12:00 a.m. Sunday to 11:59 p.m. Saturday. The date of the determination is the date printed on the determination notice. If no notice is issued, it is the date that the denial action was entered into the agency's record system or that a permanent stop payment order was issued.

The sampling frame for monetary denied claims is constructed slightly differently as it is possible that a UI claim may initially be denied for insufficient wages but subsequently become monetarily eligible upon the addition of wages from out-of-state employers (combined wage claims), Federal wages (UCFE and/or UCX programs), or as a result of the application of alternate base period formulas. In order to allow time for SWAs to request and receive Federal, out of state, and recently earned wage credits, the sampling frame for monetary denials is constructed two weeks after the week ending date of the initial claim. For example, the sampling frame for batch 201810 (March 4 - 10, 2018) will consist of new initial and transitional claims filed on or before February 24 for which the most recent determination issued between February 18 and March 10 denies monetary eligibility.

c. Case Investigation. BAM paid and denied claims case investigations are conducted according to the methods and procedures documented in ET Handbook 395; case investigation procedures for both paid and denied claims are described in detail in chapter VI, except as noted in chapter VIII for denied claims investigations. The information that is collected isspecified in the data collection instruments (DCIs) for both paid and denied claims.

BAM investigators collect DCI information from SWA records, claimant questionnaires, and interviews with employers and other. The parties with information relevant to the paid or denied claim. The investigator then records this information in an automated database, which consists of individual data records for each sampled paid claim and denial.

All paid and denied claims investigations involve one state investigator and one claimant. The person whose claim was either paid or denied is contacted in-person, by telephone, or by mail. BAM investigators obtain Information from employers (and their representatives) and "third parties" -- persons other than the claimant or employer, such as a doctor, school, or labor union, who possess information pertinent to the paid or denied case.

Unlike the investigation of paid claims, in which all decisions affecting claimant eligibility that precede the compensated week selected for the sample are evaluated, the investigation of denied claims is limited to the issue upon which the denial decision was based. For example, if a continued week claim is denied because the agency determined the claimant was not available for work, then only the availability issue will be investigated. The monetary, separation and any other nonmonetary determinations which could have affected eligibility for the week claimed will not be investigated. SWAs have the flexibility to conduct the investigation of both paid denied claims for UI by in-person interview, telephone, mail or fax, as they deem appropriate.

2. Describe the procedures for the collection of information including:

a. Stratification and Sample Selection. For both paid and denied claims, each state's sample is stratified by week (which BAM refers to as a batch). For denied claims, samples are selected from sampling frames for each of the three types of denials (monetary, separation, and nonseparation). Systematic samples are selected weekly using software and random start numbers provided by the Department. Annual estimates are weighted to reflect the sample stratification. The formulae used to produce weighted estimates for paid and denied claims accuracy rates are in Attachment B-1.

b. Estimation Procedure. See Attachment B-1 for the formulae used to estimate paid and denied claims accuracy rates and sampling variances.

c. Degree of Accuracy Needed. The Department has adopted a standard for data publication that the 95% confidence interval (roughly two times the standard error of estimate) will be estimated and displayed for each estimated accuracy rate. Attachment B-2 displays the estimated rates and sampling errors for calendar year (IPIA) 2018 BAM paid claims results for the following types of overpayments:

Overpayment Rate - The overpayment rate is defined in UIPL No. 09-13, Change 1. It is the total weighted amount of payments determined to be overpaid divided by the weighted dollar amount paid in the BAM sample population. The rate includes fraud, nonfraud recoverable, and nonfraud nonrecoverable overpayments. It excludes payments that are technically proper due to finality, warnings issued for the failure to conduct an active search for work, or due to rules other than finality. All causes and responsible parties are included in this rate.

Underpayment Rate – The underpayment rate is defined in UIPL No. 9-13 Change 1. It is the total weighted amount of payments determined to be underpaid divided by the weighted dollar amount paid in the BAM sample population. All causes and responsible parties are included in this rate. It includes errors where additional payment is made to the claimant. It excludes those errors that are technically proper due to finality rules or technically proper due to rules other than finality.

Improper Payment Rate – This rate includes UI benefits overpaid plus UI benefits underpaid divided by the total amount of UI benefits paid. Overpayments, underpayments, and total UI benefits paid are estimated from the BAM survey results of paid UI claims in the state UI, UCFE, and UCX programs. Overpayments and underpayments determined to be technically proper under state UI law for finality and other reasons are excluded from the measure.

Agency Responsibility Rate - This rate includes overpayments for which the SWA was either solely responsible or shared responsibility with claimants, employers, or third parties, such as labor unions or private employment referral agencies. The rate includes fraud, nonfraud recoverable overpayments, and nonfraud nonrecoverable overpayments. It excludes payments that are technically proper due to finality or other rules.

Fraud Rate - The definition of unemployment compensation (UC) fraud varies from state to state – there is no federal definition of fraud in the UC program. Generally, fraud involves a knowing and willful act and/or concealment of material facts to obtain or increase benefits when benefits are not due. States vary on the level of evidence required to demonstrate a knowing and willful act or the concealment of facts. An overpayment which is classified as a fraud overpayment in one state might be determined to be a nonfraud overpayment in another state. Often fraud determinations include looking at a pattern of action or the claimant's certification of erroneous information under the penalty of perjury. Also states differ on the implementing fraud administrative penalty determinations. In some states, a fraud determination becomes effective on the date of the fraudulent act. In other states, the administrative penalty takes effect on the determination date. Since fraud determination criteria and thresholds vary throughout the SWAs, the individual state rates reflect these differences. The rate includes all causes and responsible parties.

Attachment B-3 displays the estimated rates and sampling errors for IPIA 2018 BAM denied claims results for monetary, separation, and nonseparation issues. Improper Denial Rates - BAM estimates the percentage of claimants improperly denied benefits. This rate includes three subcategories. These subcategories are monetary denials, separation denials, and nonseparation denials. The BAM program does not assign a dollar estimate to improper denial rates; however, improper denials are corrected when permitted by law.

d. Unusual problems requiring specialized sampling procedures. BAM paid and denied claims does not involve any unusual problems requiring specialized sampling procedures.

e. Use of periodic data collection to reduce burden. Less frequent data collection cycles would not be an appropriate means for reducing burden. This issue is addressed in Part A of the Justification, section A-6. To make reliable estimates of accuracy in a highly seasonal program such as UI, sampling must occur continuously. BAM paid and denied claims samples are drawn weekly. The continuous investigation of these samples, with regular data entry, also provides up-to-date information on accuracy to facilitate continuous improvement. Because the samples are weekly, they can be aggregated over various time periods for analytical purposes.

3. Describe methods to maximize response rates and to deal with issues of non-response. The accuracy and reliability of information collected must be shown to be adequate for intended uses. For collections based on sampling, a special justification must be provided for any collection that will not yield "reliable" data that can be generalized to the universe studied.

Because claimants are required to provide information concerning their continued eligibility for UI benefits, nonresponse to the BAM claimant questionnaire can affect eligibility for benefit payments. The response rate for claimant contacts (that is, the percentage of claimant questionnaires completed) for BAM paid claims is approximately 87.24% percent. It is more

difficult to obtain a complete questionnaire from claimants who were denied benefits. Some of these individuals have returned to work or have relocated and are unavailable for interview.

Even if claimant information cannot be obtained directly, BAM investigators can obtain sufficient information from SWA records, and other relevant parties in order to reach an informed decision concerning the accuracy of the decision to deny benefits. The BAM investigators verify all information provided by UI recipients or obtained from automated file systems and other agency records. They contact all employers for whom the claimant worked before becoming unemployed or who provided part-time work during the claims series or were contacted in job search, as well as interested third parties, such as labor unions or employment agencies. The national case completion rate when all contacts are considered has consistently been over 99 percent for both paid and denied claims.

In IPIA 2018, although the percentage of claimant questionnaires completed varied considerably by sample type, states were able to complete nearly all of their cases based on agency documentation, employer, and third party information. The following table summarizes claimant response by data collection method. Attachment B-4 displays the response rates for the *IPIA 2018* BAM paid claims samples, and Attachment B-5 displays the response rates for the IPIA 2018 BAM denied claims samples.

BAM Case Completion and Claimant Interview Method -- IPIA 2018

Sample Type	Cases Sampled	Valid Cases*	Cases Completed**	Percent Complete	In-Person	Tele-Phone	Mail	No Clmnt. Inter.
Paid Claims	24,274	24,194	24,180	99.94%	5.28%	39.79%	42.17%	12.76%
Monetary	8,233	8,040	8,009	99.61%	0.59%	38.08%	18.69%	42.55%
Separation	8,054	8,017	8,007	99.88%	0.70%	37.98%	21.89%	39.37%
Nonseparation	8,128	8,056	8,027	99.64%	0.88%	41.20%	27.22%	30.55%

* Cases sampled minus cases deleted because they did not meet the definition for inclusion in the survey population and denied claims that were withdrawn by the claimant. Puerto Rico's UI and BAM programs were impacted by a catastrophic event. Valid and completed cases shown here include paid claim cases for Puerto Rico batch range 201727 through 201813 where completed, they are not included in the Improper Payment calculations below. The data shown reflects the number of valid cases completed which were signed off by the BAM program's supervisor as the close of business on 10/31/2018.

The Department is acutely aware of the importance of claimant response to the BAM questionnaire and has established a Federal-State workgroup to examine the issue of claimant nonresponse. The Department has drafted an advisory, which is currently in Department clearance, to issue guidance to address the specific issues of adjudicating work search and reporting errors when the claimant fails to respond to the BAM audit questionnaire.

In addition, in order to reduce nonresponse error and maintain coding consistency, the Department will continue to conduct training for BAM supervisors and investigators and hold Federal-State peer reviews of completed BAM audits to ensure that coding accurately reflects state law and policy and that states are following the BAM methodology.

In order to reduce respondent burden and maximize claimant response, the number of data elements collected for DCA is significantly smaller than the amount of data collected for BAM paid claims. Because only information relevant to the monetary, separation, or nonseparation

denial issue is verified, the number of data elements per case is one-third or less of the number collected for BAM paid claims, which investigates decisions at all three points in the UI claims process. In addition, SWAs follow up the initial claimant contact with a sufficient number of call-backs and re-contact attempts to demonstrate that a reasonable attempt was made to obtain the information.

SWAs administering the BAM program are encouraged to:

- Use all available data collection methods -- in-person, telephone, mail, e-mail, and fax -- to complete their investigations;

- Be as flexible as feasible in accommodating the schedules of claimants, employers, and other relevant parties;

- Develop clear and concise questionnaires and scripts which clearly explain the purpose of the data collection effort and minimize the time commitment of the respondent. To this end the Department shares examples and prototype case investigation materials in order to disseminate best practices as widely as possible;

- Clearly inform the respondents that the privacy of the information they provide will be strictly maintained and that any information that can identify an individual, such as a claimant's social security number, will not be shared with the Department's or any other state's record systems; and

- Emphasize to respondents that the major objective of the BAM program is the improvement of the UI system, and that their cooperation will contribute to insuring that individuals who are in fact eligible for UI benefits receive them.

4. Describe any tests of procedures or methods to be undertaken. Testing is encouraged as an effective means of refining collections of information to minimize burden and improve utility. Tests must be approved if they call for answers to identical questions from 10 or more respondents. A proposed test or set of test may be submitted for approval separately or in combination with the main collection of information.

Paid Claims

In 1991 the Department of Labor completed a pilot test of the feasibility and cost-effectiveness of telephone contacts in lieu of in-person interviews with claimants, employers, and third parties. Four states participated in the pilot test, giving a wide range of economic, social and geographical environments. The pilot showed that the telephone was reasonably effective in detecting overpayment and underpayment errors: the patterns of erroneous payments by type and cause were basically the same as detected by the in-person control investigations. Although the rate of dollars overpaid discovered by the two methods in one state was virtually identical, in the other three the telephone estimate was only 60% of the in-person estimate. The pilot showed that the telephone methodology was very effective for certain aspects of BAM investigations, but less so for others. It also showed that BAM investigations could be done considerably less expensively by telephone--at about half the cost, confirming the estimate from a similar pilot project conducted in Idaho in the late 1980s.

Denied Claims

In 1987 the Department completed a five-state pilot test of using the BAM field-check methodology for determining the accuracy of benefit denial decisions. Three different sampling designs were evaluated in the 1986-87 pilot: (1) separate sampling frames for monetary, separation, and nonseparation (continuing eligibility) denials and a single sampling frame for all paid claims; (2) separate sampling frames for denials and decisions to affirm eligibility at the monetary, separation, and nonseparation points of determination in the UI claims process; and (3) a longitudinal approach, in which claimants were sampled at the time that the initial claim was filed, and eligibility determinations (either to deny or affirm eligibility) were investigated as they occurred during the claims process. The 1997-98 DCA pilot was based on model 1, which was the simplest design and preserved the design used for BAM paid claims. As noted in Part A, the Department has relied on results of the 1997-98 DCA pilot to estimate case-completion times and burden hours for national implementation of DCA.

5. Provide the name and telephone number of individuals consulted on statistical aspects of the design and the name of the agency unit, contractor(s), grantee(s), or other person(s) who will actually collect and/or analyze the information for the agency.

The following individual consulted on statistical aspects of the design.

Andy Spisak
571 481-0450

The following individual collect and analyze the paid and denied claims data and may be contacted for further information:

Ross Miller, Employment and Training Administration, Office of Unemployment Insurance
Phone: 202-693-3178, E-mail: miller.ross@dol.gov

Estimation Procedure for Benefit Accuracy Measurement

BAM Paid Claims

1. Ratio Estimate of Overpayment Rate

The parameter to be estimated, R_o, is the ratio of Unemployment Insurance (UI) benefits overpaid to total UI benefits paid: $R_o = Y/X$, where Y = Total dollars overpaid in the population and X = Total UI benefits paid in the population.

R_o is estimated by the sample ratio:

$$r_o = \left(\sum_{h=1}^{H} (N_h / m_h) \sum_{i=1}^{m_h} y_{hi} \right) / \left(\sum_{h=1}^{H} (N_h / m_h) \sum_{i=1}^{m_h} x_{hi} \right)$$

where:

H = Number of batches (weekly samples) in the period for which the estimate is being made.

N_h = Total number of UI payments in the population for batch h. (Note: This value is available from state automated record systems and does not have to be estimated.)

m_h = Number of completed sample cases in batch h.

x_{hi} = Amount of UI benefits paid/offset for the i^{th} case in batch h.

y_{hi} = Dollars overpaid for the i^{th} case in batch h.

Nonresponse is assumed to be random.

2. Sampling Variance of Ratio Estimate of Overpayment Rate

The following formula will be used to estimate the sampling variance of the ratio estimate of the BAM paid claims overpayment rate.

(Note: Because the sampling fractions, $f_h = m_h/N_h$, are negligible, the term $(1-f_h)$ has been omitted from the equations.)

$$\text{estVar}(r_o) = \frac{\sum_{h=1}^{H} [(N_h^2 / m_h)(s_{yh}^2 + r_o^2 * s_{xh}^2 - 2 * r_o * s_{yxh})]}{N^2 \bar{X}^2}$$

$$= \frac{\sum_{h=1}^{H} [(N_h^2 / m_h)(s_{yh}^2 + r_o^2 * s_{xh}^2 - 2 * r_o * s_{yxh})]}{X^2}$$

where:

$$s_{yh}^2 = \frac{\left(\sum_{i=1}^{m_h} y_{hi}^2\right) - \left[\left(\sum_{i=1}^{m_h} y_{hi}\right)^2 / m_h\right]}{(m_h - 1)}$$

is the sample variance of the dollars overpaid;

$$s_{xh}^2 = \frac{\left(\sum_{i=1}^{m_h} x_{hi}^2\right) - \left[\left(\sum_{i=1}^{m_h} x_{hi}\right)^2 / m_h\right]}{(m_h - 1)}$$

is the sample variance of the dollars paid/offset; and

$$s_{yxh} = \frac{\left(\sum_{i=1}^{m_h} \langle x_{hi} * y_{hi} \rangle\right) - \left[\left(\sum_{i=1}^{m_h} x_{hi}\right)\left(\sum_{i=1}^{m_h} y_{hi}\right) / m_h\right]}{(m_h - 1)}$$

is the sample covariance of the dollars overpaid and the dollars paid/offset.

X = Total population dollars paid/offset for the H batches.
(Note: This value is available from state automated record systems and does not have to be estimated.)

3. Ratio Estimate of Overpayment Rate for Subgroups

The parameter to be estimated, R_{ok}, is the ratio of Unemployment Insurance (UI) benefits overpaid to total UI benefits paid for population subgroup *k*: $R_{ok} = Y_k/X_k$, where Y_k=Total dollars overpaid in the population for the k^{th} subgroup and X_k=Total UI benefits paid in the population for the k^{th} subgroup.

R_{ok} is estimated by the sample ratio:

$$r_{ok} = \left(\sum_{h=1}^{H} \left(N_h / m_h \right) \sum_{i=1}^{m_h} y_{hik} \right) / \left(\sum_{h=1}^{H} \left(N_h / m_h \right) \sum_{i=1}^{m_h} x_{hik} \right)$$

where:

x_{hik} = Amount of UI benefits paid/offset for the i^{th} case in the k^{th} subgroup in batch h.

$x_{hik} = x_{hi}$, for hi in the k^{th} subgroup, and
$x_{hik} = 0$, for hi *not* in the k^{th} subgroup

y_{hik} = Dollars overpaid for the i^{th} case in the k^{th} subgroup in batch h.

$y_{hik} = y_{hi}$, for hi in the k^{th} subgroup, and
$y_{hik} = 0$, for hi *not* in the k^{th} subgroup

Nonresponse is assumed to be random.

4. Sampling Variance of Ratio Estimate of Overpayment Rate for Subgroups

The following formula will be used to estimate the sampling variances of the ratio estimate of the overpayment rate for subgroups.

(Note: Because the sampling fractions, $f_h=m_h/N_h$, are negligible, the term $(1-f_h)$ has been omitted from the equations.)

$$\text{estVar}(r_{ok}) = \frac{\sum_{h=1}^{H} \left[\left(N_h^2 / m_h \right) \left(s_{yh(k)}^2 + r_{ok}^2 * s_{xh(k)}^2 - 2 * r_{ok} * s_{yxh(k)} \right) \right]}{X_k'^2}$$

where:

$$s^2_{yh(k)} = \frac{\left(\sum_{i=1}^{m_h} y^2_{hik} \right) - \left[\left(\sum_{i=1}^{m_h} y_{hik} \right)^2 / m_h \right]}{(m_h - 1)}$$

is the sample variance of the dollars overpaid in the k[th] subgroup;

$$s^2_{xh(k)} = \frac{\left(\sum_{i=1}^{m_h} x^2_{hik} \right) - \left[\left(\sum_{i=1}^{m_h} x_{hik} \right)^2 / m_h \right]}{(m_h - 1)}$$

is the sample variance of the dollars paid/offset in the k[th] subgroup; and

$$s_{yxh(k)} = \frac{\left(\sum_{i=1}^{m_h} \langle x_{hik} * y_{hik} \rangle \right) - \left[\left(\sum_{i=1}^{m_h} x_{hik} \right) \left(\sum_{i=1}^{m_h} y_{hik} \right) / m_h \right]}{(m_h - 1)}$$

is the sample covariance of the dollars overpaid and the dollars paid/offset.

$$X_k' = \sum_{h=1}^{H} [(N_h / m_h) x_{hk}]$$

is the estimated total dollars paid/offset for the H batches.

In the preceeding formulas,

$x_{hik} = x_{hi}$, for hi in the kth subgroup, and
$x_{hik} = 0$, for hi *not* in the kth subgroup;

$y_{hik} = y_{hi}$, for hi in the kth subgroup, and
$y_{hik} = 0$, for hi *not* in the kth subgroup

x_{hk} = Amount of UI benefits paid/offset in the k[th] subgroup in the sample in batch h.

5. Ratio Estimate of Proper Payment Rate

The parameter to be estimated, R_p, is the ratio of Unemployment Insurance (UI) benefits properly paid to total UI benefits paid: $R_p = Z/X$, where Z = Total dollars properly paid in the population and X = Total UI benefits paid in the population.

R_p is estimated by the sample ratio:

$$r_p = \left(\sum_{h=1}^{H} (N_h / m_h) \sum_{i=1}^{m_h} z_{hi} \right) / \left(\sum_{h=1}^{H} (N_h / m_h) \sum_{i=1}^{m_h} x_{hi} \right)$$

where H, N_h, m_h, and x_{hi} are defined as in 1., above, and

z_{hi} = Dollars properly paid (dollars paid - dollars overpaid) for the i^{th} case in batch h.

6. Sampling Variance of Ratio Estimate of Proper Payment Rate

The following formula will be used to estimate the sampling variance of the ratio estimate of the BAM paid claims proper payment rate.

(Note: Because the sampling fractions, $f_h=m_h/N_h$, are negligible, the term $(1-f_h)$ has been omitted from the equations.)

$$\text{estVar}(r_p) = \frac{\sum_{h=1}^{H} [(N_h^2 / m_h) (s_{zh}^2 + r_p^2 * s_{xh}^2 - 2 * r_p * s_{zxh})]}{X^2}$$

where H, N_h, m_h, X, and s^2_{xh} are defined as in 1. and 2., above;

s^2_{zh} is the sample variance of the dollars properly paid; and

s_{zxh} is the sample covariance of the dollars properly paid and dollars paid.

7. Ratio Estimate of Proper Payment Rate for Subgroups

The parameter to be estimated, R_{pk}, is the ratio of Unemployment Insurance (UI) benefits properly paid to total UI benefits paid for population subgroup *k*: $R_{pk} = Z_k/X_k$, where Z_k=Total dollars properly paid in the population for the k^{th} subgroup and X_k=Total UI benefits paid in the population for the k^{th} subgroup.

R_{pk} is estimated by the sample ratio r_{pk} which is defined as the estimator r_{ok} in section 3, above, except that:

z_{hik} = Dollars properly paid (dollars paid - dollars overpaid) for the i^{th} case in the k^{th} subgroup in batch h.

$z_{hik} = z_{hi}$, for hi in the k^{th} subgroup, and
$z_{hik} = 0$, for hi *not* in the k^{th} subgroup

8. Sampling Variance of Ratio Estimate of Proper Payment Rate for Subgroups

The following formula will be used to estimate the sampling variances of the ratio estimate of the proper payment rate for subgroups.

(Note: Because the sampling fractions, $f_h=m_h/N_h$, are negligible, the term $(1-f_h)$ has been omitted from the equations.)

$$\text{estVar}(r_{pk}) = \frac{\sum_{h=1}^{H}[(N_h^2/m_h)(s^2_{zh(k)} + r^2_{pk} * s^2_{xh(k)} - 2 * r_{pk} * s_{zxh(k)})]}{X'^2_k}$$

where H, N_h, m_h, X'^2_k, and $s^2_{xh(k)}$ are defined as in 1.and 4., above;

$s^2_{zh(k)}$ is the sample variance of the dollars properly paid in the k^{th} subgroup; and

$s_{zxh(k)}$ is the sample covariance of the dollars properly paid and dollars paid in the k^{th} subgroup.

9. Ratio Estimate of Underpayment Rate

The parameter to be estimated, R_u is the ratio of Unemployment Insurance (UI) benefits underpaid to total UI benefits paid: $R_u = U/X$, where U = Total dollars underpaid in the population and X = Total UI benefits paid in the population.

R_u is estimated by the sample ratio:

$$r_u = \left(\sum_{h=1}^{H}(N_h/m_h)\sum_{i=1}^{m_h} u_{hi}\right) / \left(\sum_{h=1}^{H}(N_h/m_h)\sum_{i=1}^{m_h} x_{hi}\right)$$

where H, N_h, m_h, and x_{hi} are defined as in 1., above, and

u_{hi} = Dollars underpaid for the i^{th} case in batch h.

10. Sampling Variance of Ratio Estimate of Underpayment Rate

The following formula will be used to estimate the sampling variance of the ratio estimate of the BAM paid claims underpayment rate.

(Note: Because the sampling fractions, $f_h=m_h/N_h$, are negligible, the term $(1-f_h)$ has been omitted from the equations.)

$$\text{estVar}(r_u) = \frac{\sum_{h=1}^{H} [(N_h^2/m_h)(s_{uh}^2 + r_u^2 * s_{xh}^2 - 2 * r_u * s_{uxh})]}{X^2}$$

where H, N_h, m_h, X, and s^2_{xh} are defined as in 1. and 2., above;

s^2_{uh} is the sample variance of the dollars underpaid; and

s_{uxh} is the sample covariance of the dollars underpaid and dollars paid.

11. Ratio Estimate of Underpayment Rate for Subgroups

The parameter to be estimated, R_{uk}, is the ratio of Unemployment Insurance (UI) benefits underpaid to total UI benefits paid for population subgroup *k*: $R_{uk} = U_k/X_k$, where U_k=Total dollars underpaid in the population for the k^{th} subgroup and X_k=Total UI benefits paid in the population for the k^{th} subgroup.

R_{uk} is estimated by the sample ratio r_{uk} which is defined as the estimator r_{ok} in section 3, above, <u>except that</u>:

u_{hik} = Dollars underpaid for the i^{th} case in the k^{th} subgroup in batch h.

$u_{hik} = u_{hi}$, for hi in the k^{th} subgroup, and
$u_{hik} = 0$, for hi *not* in the k^{th} subgroup

12. Sampling Variance of Ratio Estimate of Underpayment Rate for Subgroups

The following formula will be used to estimate the sampling variances of the ratio estimate of the underpayment rate for subgroups.

(Note: Because the sampling fractions, $f_h=m_h/N_h$, are negligible, the term $(1-f_h)$ has been omitted from the equations.)

$$\text{estVar}(r_{uk}) = \frac{\sum_{h=1}^{H} [(N_h^2/m_h)(s_{uh(k)}^2 + r_{uk}^2 * s_{xh(k)}^2 - 2 * r_{uk} * s_{uxh(k)})]}{X_k'^2}$$

where H, N_h, m_h, $X_k'^2$, and $s^2_{xh(k)}$ are defined as in 1.and 4., above;

$s^2_{uh(k)}$ is the sample variance of the dollars underpaid in the k^{th} subgroup; and

$s_{uxh(k)}$ is the sample covariance of the dollars underpaid and dollars paid in the k^{th} subgroup.

Confidence Intervals

The 95% confidence interval for any estimated ratio r_θ (1, 3, 5, 7, 9, or 11, above) is:

$$r_\theta - (1.96 * \sqrt{estVar(r_\theta)})$$

$$r_\theta + (1.96 * \sqrt{estVar(r_\theta)})$$

Coefficient of Variation

The coefficient of variation (cv) of an estimate r_θ is:

$$cv(r_\theta) = \frac{\sqrt{VAR(r_\theta)}}{E(r_\theta)}$$

$$cv(r_\theta) = \frac{SE(r_\theta)}{E(r_\theta)}$$

BAM Denied Claims

Equations for Case Error Estimates

The following notation will be used:

H = the number of weeks (batches) in the period for which the estimate is being made.

N_h = the number of denied claims in week *h*.

X_h = the number of claims in week *h* which were erroneously denied.

P_h = X_h/N_h = the proportion of claims in week *h* which were erroneously denied.

$N_\bullet = \sum_{h=1}^{H} N_h$ = total number of denied claims in the period.

$X_\bullet = \sum_{h=1}^{H} X_h$ = total number of claims erroneously denied in the period.

The parameter to be estimated, P, is the proportion of claims erroneously denied during the period. Estimates will be made for each of the three denial universes -- monetary, separation, and nonseparation. We wish to estimate:

$$P = X_\bullet/N_\bullet = N_{-}^{-1} \sum_{h=1}^{H} N_h P_h$$

Now let

m_h = the number of <u>completed</u> sample claims for week *h*.

$m_\bullet = \sum_{h=1}^{H} m_h$ = total number of completed sample claims in the period.

x_h = the number of claims in week *h* which were erroneously denied.

$\hat{P}_h = x_h / m_h$ = proportion of sample claims in week *h* which were erroneously denied.

If it is assumed that non-response is "at random", then $E(\hat{P}_h) = E(x_h / m_h) = X_h / N_h = P_h$.

It follows that $\hat{P} = N^{-1} \sum_{h=1}^{H} N_h \hat{P}_h$ is unbiased for P. Furthermore, as sampling is independent within each week (stratum), it follows that

where $f_h = m_h/N_h$. The usual estimator for $var(\hat{P})$ is

$$\hat{var}(\hat{P}) = N^{-2} \sum_{h=1}^{H} N_h^2 (1 - f_h) \frac{\hat{P}_h(1 - \hat{P}_h)}{(m_h - 1)}.$$

If f_h is negligible then

$$\hat{var}(\hat{P}) = N^{-2} \sum_{h=1}^{H} N_h^2 \frac{\hat{P}_h(1 - \hat{P}_h)}{(m_h - 1)}$$

can be used for variance estimation.

Proportions for Subgroups

The proportion of denial actions which were incorrectly decided may be estimated for population subgroups, for example UI program (State UI, UCFE, UCX), filing method (in-person, telephone, mail), or demographic classifications.

Building on the notation above, for the k^{th} subgroup and the h^{th} week let

N_{hk} = the number of denied claims.

X_{hk} = the number of claims were erroneously denied.

P_{hk} = X_{hk}/N_{hk} = the proportion of claims which were erroneously denied.

Then for the k^{th} subgroup we have

$N_{\bullet k} = \sum_{h=1}^{H} N_{hk}$ = total number of denied claims in the period.

$X_{\bullet k} = \sum_{h=1}^{H} X_{hk}$ = total number of claims erroneously denied in the period.

The parameter to be estimated, $P_{\bullet k}$, is the proportion of claims erroneously denied during the period for subgroup *k*. Analogous to previous work, we can write

$$P_{\bullet k} = X_{\bullet k}/N_{\bullet k} = N_{\_k}^{-1} \sum_{h=1}^{H} N_{hk} P_{hk} .$$

Note that neither $X_{\bullet k}$ nor $N_{\bullet k}$ is known. For the k^{th} subgroup, h^{th} week, let

m_{hk} = the number of <u>completed</u> sample claims for week *h*.

x_{hk} = the number of claims in week *h* which were erroneously denied.

Assuming nonresponse is "at random", $\hat{X}_{\_k} = \sum_{h=1}^{H} \frac{N_h}{m_h} x_{hk}$ is unbiased for $X_{\bullet k}$ and

$\hat{N}_{\_k} = \sum_{h=1}^{H} \frac{N_h}{m_h} m_{hk}$ is unbiased for $N_{\bullet k}$. The ratio estimator $\hat{P}_{\_k} = \hat{X}_{\_k} / \hat{N}_{\_k}$ is approximately unbiased for $P_{\bullet k}$, and

$$var(\hat{P}_{\_k}) \cong N_{\_k}^{-2} \sum_{h=1}^{H} (1 - f_{hk}) \frac{N_h^2 \theta_{hk}}{m_h} [P_{hk}(1 - P_{hk}) + (1 - \theta_{hk})(P_{hk} - P_{.k})^2]$$

where $f_{hk} = m_{hk}/N_{hk}$ and $\theta_{hk} = N_{hk}/N_h$. Assuming that f_{hk} is negligible, an estimate for the variance is given by

$$\hat{v}ar(\hat{P}_{\_k}) = \hat{N}_{\_k}^{-2} \sum_{h=1}^{H} \frac{N_h^2 \hat{\theta}_{hk}}{(m_h - 1)} [\hat{P}_{hk}(1 - \hat{P}_{hk}) + (1 - \hat{\theta}_{hk})(\hat{P}_{hk} - \hat{P}_{.k})^2]$$

where

$\hat{\theta}_{hk} = m_{hk} / m_h$ and

$$\hat{P}_{hk} = \begin{cases} x_{hk} / m_{hk} & if \ m_{hk} > 0 \\ 0 & otherwise \end{cases} .$$

Confidence Intervals

The 95% confidence interval for any estimate (u) is:

$$u - (1.96 * \sqrt{VAR(u)})$$

$$u + (1.96 * \sqrt{VAR(u)})$$

Coefficient of Variation

The coefficient of variation (cv) of an estimate u is:

$$cv(u) = \frac{\sqrt{VAR(u)}}{E(u)}$$

$$cv(u) = \frac{SE(u)}{E(u)}$$

Attachment B-2

UI Benefit Accuracy Measurement Rates
Batch Range 201727 through 201826

ST	Sample	Total Number of Weeks compensated in population sampled	Total Amount of benefits compensated in population sampled	Overpay-ment (OP) Rate (a)	OP Rate 95% CI +/-	Underpay-ment (UP) Rate (c)	UP Rate 95% CI +/-	Improper Payment Rate (OP+UP) [(a)+(c)]	Fraud Rate	Fraud Rate 95% CI +/-	Agency Responsible Rate	AGY Resp Rate 95% CI +/-
US	24,152	81,210,211	$27,949,217,692	12.537%	0.654%	0.415%	0.080%	12.952%	3.519%	0.415%	1.633%	0.239%
AK	482	400,224	$103,941,330	5.823%	2.072%	0.848%	0.487%	6.671%	1.282%	1.034%	0.219%	0.340%
AL	484	714,624	$158,735,458	9.756%	2.683%	0.144%	0.150%	9.900%	3.702%	1.678%	0.940%	0.912%
AR	481	462,922	$125,816,306	9.331%	2.675%	0.533%	0.406%	9.864%	6.378%	2.265%	1.362%	1.015%
AZ	480	980,925	$222,966,215	15.089%	3.241%	0.126%	0.176%	15.214%	6.720%	2.365%	4.722%	1.924%
CA	931	16,221,891	$5,146,825,593	7.055%	1.736%	0.097%	0.066%	7.152%	5.075%	1.527%	1.269%	0.800%
CO	480	949,958	$404,990,768	9.843%	2.710%	0.419%	0.324%	10.261%	0.571%	0.636%	1.759%	1.219%
CT	483	1,730,588	$634,191,102	19.518%	3.949%	0.119%	0.080%	19.637%	2.270%	1.349%	0.656%	0.623%
DC	364	387,662	$131,962,672	10.964%	2.958%	0.927%	0.872%	11.891%	3.029%	1.774%	1.625%	1.142%
DE	361	263,387	$66,764,121	8.669%	2.885%	0.326%	0.275%	8.995%	1.656%	1.284%	1.489%	1.308%
FL	470	1,505,296	$361,633,812	13.089%	3.198%	0.255%	0.280%	13.343%	3.464%	1.743%	8.028%	2.589%
GA	520	1,132,045	$318,553,479	4.067%	1.733%	0.017%	0.033%	4.084%	1.031%	0.907%	1.134%	0.885%
HI	364	346,041	$168,751,989	2.334%	1.479%	0.174%	0.152%	2.508%	1.109%	1.044%	0.431%	0.620%
IA	480	1,002,873	$380,938,003	10.764%	2.868%	0.327%	0.206%	11.090%	0.994%	0.839%	1.803%	1.162%
ID	485	285,672	$87,685,775	15.359%	3.571%	0.273%	0.256%	15.631%	5.554%	2.395%	1.739%	1.615%
IL	480	4,480,479	$1,693,469,532	9.763%	2.581%	0.851%	0.517%	10.614%	1.248%	0.980%	1.038%	0.896%
IN	481	846,809	$244,559,290	9.899%	2.937%	0.253%	0.195%	10.152%	1.785%	1.527%	2.161%	1.414%
KS	484	444,055	$166,166,109	13.781%	3.281%	0.228%	0.213%	14.009%	1.288%	0.990%	0.524%	0.628%
KY	520	796,820	$284,886,998	22.148%	3.520%	0.116%	0.156%	22.263%	3.270%	1.515%	19.424%	3.312%
LA	481	719,326	$151,538,544	10.375%	2.740%	0.178%	0.162%	10.552%	4.435%	1.899%	4.317%	1.904%
MA	488	2,895,140	$1,417,506,168	24.327%	4.111%	0.720%	0.387%	25.046%	4.729%	1.830%	2.894%	1.361%
MD	492	1,443,991	$488,237,986	21.513%	3.856%	0.143%	0.119%	21.656%	2.373%	1.428%	1.606%	1.323%
ME	481	243,251	$79,435,192	7.592%	2.347%	0.336%	0.227%	7.929%	1.937%	1.398%	0.289%	0.330%
MI	480	2,392,155	$674,708,410	44.425%	5.211%	0.298%	0.311%	44.723%	3.939%	2.082%	1.268%	1.079%
MN	483	1,822,682	$794,221,635	6.502%	2.191%	0.225%	0.239%	6.727%	1.547%	0.964%	0.175%	0.248%

UI Benefit Accuracy Measurement Rates
Batch Range 201727 through 201826

ST	Sample	Total Number of Weeks compensated in population sampled	Total Amount of benefits compensated in population sampled	Overpay-ment (OP) Rate (a)	OP Rate 95% CI +/-	Underpay-ment (UP) Rate (c)	UP Rate 95% CI +/-	Improper Payment Rate (OP+UP) [(a)+(c)]	Fraud Rate	Fraud Rate 95% CI +/-	Agency Responsible Rate	AGY Resp Rate 95% CI +/-
MO	480	970,411	$250,090,837	8.026%	2.330%	0.061%	0.103%	8.087%	2.751%	1.427%	0.641%	0.696%
MS	498	353,513	$71,573,522	8.489%	2.532%	0.176%	0.196%	8.666%	5.113%	2.015%	0.977%	0.779%
MT	364	329,047	$106,376,195	7.424%	2.482%	0.503%	0.633%	7.927%	1.700%	1.145%	0.540%	0.619%
NC	520	722,745	$184,737,824	23.477%	3.715%	0.139%	0.121%	23.616%	3.603%	1.571%	0.412%	0.529%
ND	360	221,272	$101,422,176	9.590%	3.633%	0.190%	0.163%	9.781%	0.099%	0.187%	0.458%	0.559%
NE	361	221,812	$72,080,264	14.909%	3.956%	0.376%	0.347%	15.285%	0.729%	0.895%	1.810%	1.306%
NH	361	143,735	$44,039,158	12.109%	3.618%	0.436%	0.436%	12.545%	6.100%	2.834%	3.139%	1.981%
NJ	484	4,588,292	$1,966,370,209	14.288%	3.081%	1.763%	0.666%	16.052%	1.800%	1.147%	1.166%	0.978%
NM	480	452,751	$149,879,352	4.417%	1.762%	0.486%	0.355%	4.903%	2.538%	1.389%	0.753%	0.746%
NV	490	834,499	$279,196,879	8.813%	2.369%	0.102%	0.100%	8.915%	3.473%	1.580%	1.689%	1.116%
NY	480	6,759,934	$2,188,817,087	13.104%	3.027%	0.467%	0.509%	13.571%	5.785%	2.060%	1.536%	1.124%
OH	481	2,390,506	$876,350,096	16.389%	3.622%	0.298%	0.223%	16.687%	0.553%	0.576%	1.091%	1.014%
OK	518	644,464	$229,523,869	2.871%	1.341%	0.319%	0.317%	3.190%	1.005%	0.776%	0.175%	0.341%
OR	481	1,227,954	$472,055,984	11.537%	3.024%	0.639%	0.423%	12.176%	5.909%	2.127%	2.419%	1.425%
PA	484	5,229,625	$1,886,965,583	9.282%	2.480%	0.354%	0.356%	9.637%	7.036%	2.280%	1.627%	1.067%
PR	126	205,549	$23,720,728	10.491%	5.384%	0.247%	0.362%	10.737%	4.620%	3.702%	7.875%	4.755%
RI	482	421,902	$147,109,698	25.743%	4.454%	0.180%	0.128%	25.923%	5.269%	2.157%	1.361%	1.272%
SC	512	590,677	$156,591,169	11.592%	2.738%	0.086%	0.101%	11.677%	5.357%	1.967%	1.169%	0.855%
SD	360	85,271	$28,188,482	8.634%	2.944%	0.185%	0.160%	8.818%	3.758%	2.125%	1.101%	1.166%
TN	485	853,055	$201,593,010	16.001%	3.412%	0.229%	0.272%	16.231%	5.662%	2.156%	4.743%	1.986%
TX	483	5,718,985	$2,189,298,595	9.588%	2.848%	0.134%	0.194%	9.722%	1.828%	1.421%	0.355%	0.520%
UT	481	358,353	$142,653,937	4.229%	1.730%	0.096%	0.108%	4.325%	1.189%	0.863%	1.383%	1.003%
VA	480	1,066,725	$326,282,833	13.286%	3.048%	0.332%	0.320%	13.618%	2.736%	1.589%	4.059%	1.837%
VT	361	196,205	$64,534,665	5.113%	2.224%	0.427%	0.315%	5.539%	2.765%	1.862%	0.443%	0.523%

UI Benefit Accuracy Measurement Rates
Batch Range 201727 through 201826

Attachment B-2

ST	Sample	Total Number of Weeks compensated in population sampled	Total Amount of benefits compensated in population sampled	Overpay-ment (OP) Rate (a)	OP Rate 95% CI +/-	Underpay-ment (UP) Rate (c)	UP Rate 95% CI +/-	Improper Payment Rate (OP+UP) [(a)+(c)]	Fraud Rate	Fraud Rate 95% CI +/-	Agency Responsible Rate	AGY Resp Rate 95% CI +/-
WA	487	2,102,178	$881,213,889	19.311%	4.332%	0.281%	0.222%	19.592%	2.795%	2.087%	1.277%	1.332%
WI	483	1,399,535	$404,136,491	13.493%	3.499%	0.499%	0.510%	13.991%	1.553%	1.204%	0.720%	0.823%
WV	476	510,153	$142,184,360	4.126%	1.805%	0.209%	0.183%	4.336%	1.354%	1.077%	0.569%	0.689%
WY	359	142,247	$53,744,313	8.488%	3.160%	0.728%	0.892%	9.216%	1.318%	1.336%	2.396%	1.931%

These data are based on a completion rate of 99.99% and are subject to change upon completion of the remaining cases.

Notes: Excludes Puerto Rico data for batch range 201727 thru 201813

Prepared by: ETA Office of Unemployment Insurance on 01 Nov 18

Note: 95% C.I. is the 95 percent confidence interval for the estimated rate. The interval is the range between the rate minus the value in the 95% C.I. column and the rate plus the value in the 95% C.I. column. For example, the interval for 10.0% +/- 2.5 is 7.5% to 12.5%. The true rate is expected to lie within 95 percent of the intervals constructed from repeated samples of the same size and selected in the same manner as the BAM PCA sample.

BENEFIT ACCURACY MEASUREMENT
DENIED CLAIMS ACCURACY
IMPROPER DENIAL RATES REPORT
Batch Range: 201727~201826

State:	Denial Type	Type Population of Denials	Cases Completed*	Adjusted Improper Denial	95% C.I (+/-)	Improper Denial**	95% C.I (+/-)
Alaska	Monetary	3,989	151	12.84%	6.02%	8.88%	4.59%
Alaska	Separation	10,209	151	7.32%	4.08%	6.68%	3.89%
Alaska	Nonseparation	33,002	151	7.88%	4.31%	7.88%	4.31%
Alabama	Monetary	16,746	151	3.30%	2.91%	2.68%	2.64%
Alabama	Separation	25,750	152	3.33%	2.95%	1.37%	1.95%
Alabama	Nonseparation	19,113	153	5.75%	3.81%	3.04%	2.67%
Arkansas	Monetary	1,230	131	23.11%	8.62%	23.11%	8.62%
Arkansas	Separation	18,180	151	1.83%	2.06%	1.83%	2.06%
Arkansas	Nonseparation	9,522	151	1.96%	2.79%	1.23%	2.41%
Arizona	Monetary	57,859	150	1.74%	1.98%	1.74%	1.98%
Arizona	Separation	24,181	151	3.27%	2.91%	1.44%	2.04%
Arizona	Nonseparation	23,850	150	18.94%	6.61%	18.94%	6.61%
California	Monetary	93,809	236	26.19%	5.79%	19.85%	5.60%
California	Separation	187,989	260	15.01%	4.61%	11.98%	4.28%
California	Nonseparation	232,896	264	27.85%	5.48%	25.02%	5.26%
Colorado	Monetary	1,751	126	31.42%	8.54%	28.98%	8.20%
Colorado	Separation	42,804	154	10.61%	4.55%	7.92%	4.46%
Colorado	Nonseparation	32,804	153	11.41%	4.96%	10.77%	4.80%
Connecticut	Monetary	6,072	154	3.05%	2.76%	1.37%	1.99%
Connecticut	Separation	11,989	153	1.74%	2.06%	1.43%	1.97%
Connecticut	Nonseparation	15,321	155	5.20%	3.36%	2.63%	2.57%
District of Columbia	Monetary	2,197	137	17.51%	6.37%	16.31%	6.17%
District of Columbia	Separation	3,446	156	13.65%	4.97%	11.10%	4.82%
District of Columbia	Nonseparation	11,999	156	7.74%	4.01%	6.28%	3.66%
Delaware	Monetary	1,125	161	4.50%	3.86%	2.76%	3.20%
Delaware	Separation	4,329	153	1.57%	2.14%	0.00%	0.00%
Delaware	Nonseparation	6,379	153	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Florida	Monetary	35,404	155	7.15%	4.73%	6.61%	4.61%
Florida	Separation	43,036	156	11.17%	4.98%	2.62%	2.59%
Florida	Nonseparation	71,899	154	6.70%	4.10%	5.53%	3.75%
Georgia	Monetary	21,798	141	19.19%	7.03%	17.00%	6.57%
Georgia	Separation	49,427	156	5.73%	3.71%	0.00%	0.00%
Georgia	Nonseparation	37,191	157	5.89%	3.21%	5.34%	3.02%

DENIED CLAIMS ACCURACY
IMPROPER DENIAL RATES REPORT
Batch Range: 201727~201826

State:	Denial Type	Type Population of Denials	Cases Completed*	Adjusted Improper Denial	95% C.I (+/-)	Improper Denial**	95% C.I (+/-)
Hawaii	Monetary	911	147	6.74%	3.68%	5.61%	3.40%
Hawaii	Separation	5,024	156	15.93%	5.69%	9.62%	4.91%
Hawaii	Nonseparation	17,871	156	17.64%	5.85%	15.61%	5.64%
Iowa	Monetary	7,891	148	27.96%	7.97%	26.31%	7.85%
Iowa	Separation	18,511	154	20.07%	6.99%	12.65%	5.76%
Iowa	Nonseparation	26,281	153	13.24%	5.58%	10.67%	5.05%
Idaho	Monetary	2,614	157	11.31%	5.67%	9.25%	5.14%
Idaho	Separation	5,602	152	6.00%	3.94%	3.67%	3.20%
Idaho	Nonseparation	20,415	151	14.78%	6.14%	12.23%	5.32%
Illinois	Monetary	13,382	137	42.55%	8.41%	30.22%	9.55%
Illinois	Separation	47,674	154	21.99%	7.17%	16.88%	6.57%
Illinois	Nonseparation	40,582	154	15.59%	6.92%	12.98%	6.68%
Indiana	Monetary	15,595	155	9.91%	4.80%	9.60%	4.77%
Indiana	Separation	22,302	151	12.14%	5.56%	6.19%	3.97%
Indiana	Nonseparation	104,830	151	3.38%	2.98%	3.38%	2.98%
Kansas	Monetary	6,434	153	10.53%	5.60%	10.53%	5.60%
Kansas	Separation	17,949	160	5.79%	3.39%	4.31%	3.24%
Kansas	Nonseparation	26,233	162	5.91%	3.59%	5.37%	3.44%
Kentucky	Monetary	9,398	155	1.83%	2.53%	1.01%	1.97%
Kentucky	Separation	19,074	156	5.20%	3.21%	3.06%	2.58%
Kentucky	Nonseparation	16,583	190	6.26%	3.45%	5.45%	3.26%
Louisiana	Monetary	15,564	153	6.87%	4.26%	4.94%	3.66%
Louisiana	Separation	17,782	153	13.44%	5.51%	5.23%	3.59%
Louisiana	Nonseparation	57,805	153	11.44%	5.10%	9.99%	5.01%
Massachusetts	Monetary	20,888	145	29.69%	6.49%	21.08%	5.86%
Massachusetts	Separation	19,468	147	15.76%	6.15%	6.34%	4.07%
Massachusetts	Nonseparation	80,647	147	15.72%	5.65%	14.34%	5.60%
Maryland	Monetary	9,859	157	26.73%	6.94%	20.85%	6.81%
Maryland	Separation	38,324	155	9.33%	4.49%	8.49%	4.18%
Maryland	Nonseparation	42,993	155	13.13%	5.66%	13.13%	5.66%
Maine	Monetary	2,421	171	33.81%	9.31%	22.84%	8.85%
Maine	Separation	4,257	160	8.52%	4.26%	3.38%	2.58%
Maine	Nonseparation	8,293	157	11.38%	8.27%	10.20%	8.17%
Michigan	Monetary	40,840	152	15.80%	6.83%	14.81%	6.73%
Michigan	Separation	56,786	150	13.17%	5.92%	9.98%	5.48%
Michigan	Nonseparation	211,356	150	5.88%	4.29%	1.98%	1.94%

Batch Range: 201727~201826

State:	Denial Type	Type Population of Denials	Cases Completed*	Adjusted Improper Denial	95% C.I (+/-)	Improper Denial**	95% C.I (+/-)
Minnesota	Monetary	4,652	145	21.05%	6.50%	16.89%	6.22%
Minnesota	Separation	19,825	151	17.43%	5.09%	3.28%	2.98%
Minnesota	Nonseparation	76,751	151	10.21%	4.84%	7.93%	4.21%
Missouri	Monetary	15,818	150	8.58%	5.01%	3.70%	2.76%
Missouri	Separation	39,266	150	9.51%	4.75%	2.47%	2.45%
Missouri	Nonseparation	69,213	150	16.79%	6.34%	11.13%	5.20%
Mississippi	Monetary	6,176	168	8.56%	4.40%	6.16%	3.67%
Mississippi	Separation	17,701	168	13.06%	5.73%	6.65%	3.84%
Mississippi	Nonseparation	47,479	168	19.15%	6.25%	17.02%	5.74%
Montana	Monetary	2,107	147	7.12%	4.09%	6.83%	4.07%
Montana	Separation	5,720	157	3.60%	2.88%	2.86%	2.50%
Montana	Nonseparation	10,389	156	11.22%	5.36%	10.63%	5.24%
North Carolina	Monetary	9,294	136	12.79%	5.60%	8.11%	4.65%
North Carolina	Separation	35,395	156	5.89%	3.58%	5.28%	3.38%
North Carolina	Nonseparation	30,241	156	11.08%	5.07%	9.33%	4.81%
North Dakota	Monetary	2,651	148	13.72%	6.36%	11.69%	5.95%
North Dakota	Separation	4,316	151	13.39%	5.36%	11.91%	5.09%
North Dakota	Nonseparation	12,513	151	11.12%	5.08%	7.13%	4.17%
Nebraska	Monetary	2,029	147	10.12%	4.49%	7.47%	4.35%
Nebraska	Separation	27,581	151	3.96%	3.25%	3.21%	2.90%
Nebraska	Nonseparation	30,102	150	12.78%	5.41%	6.04%	3.40%
New Hampshire	Monetary	1,113	152	24.07%	6.25%	11.59%	5.13%
New Hampshire	Separation	2,492	156	17.08%	6.08%	3.96%	3.20%
New Hampshire	Nonseparation	9,156	156	17.34%	6.55%	11.56%	5.39%
New Jersey	Monetary	30,224	151	14.85%	5.65%	11.32%	5.19%
New Jersey	Separation	52,268	153	5.45%	3.52%	4.03%	2.92%
New Jersey	Nonseparation	56,527	156	8.47%	4.24%	7.11%	4.04%
New Mexico	Monetary	2,351	140	22.48%	7.25%	20.71%	6.91%
New Mexico	Separation	7,575	152	7.64%	4.32%	5.83%	4.04%
New Mexico	Nonseparation	19,249	149	2.04%	1.89%	1.29%	1.51%
Nevada	Monetary	5,613	139	21.42%	7.20%	17.72%	6.69%
Nevada	Separation	26,949	155	13.56%	5.25%	8.61%	4.68%
Nevada	Nonseparation	33,009	155	20.51%	6.66%	17.95%	6.16%
New York	Monetary	33,918	132	23.59%	7.95%	20.37%	7.59%
New York	Separation	68,675	150	8.48%	4.42%	5.91%	3.89%
New York	Nonseparation	162,923	149	6.41%	4.11%	3.88%	3.47%

State:	Denial Type	Type Population of Denials	Cases Completed*	Adjusted Improper Denial	95% C.I (+/-)	Improper Denial**	95% C.I (+/-)
Ohio	Monetary	29,456	150	17.85%	6.44%	12.19%	5.77%
Ohio	Separation	35,750	151	5.29%	3.48%	2.07%	2.34%
Ohio	Nonseparation	117,951	151	15.16%	6.16%	13.09%	5.67%
Oklahoma	Monetary	8,071	160	8.08%	4.07%	6.11%	3.39%
Oklahoma	Separation	18,135	166	6.55%	3.92%	0.00%	0.00%
Oklahoma	Nonseparation	15,366	167	1.90%	1.89%	1.48%	1.70%
Oregon	Monetary	7,342	144	25.66%	7.65%	21.41%	7.00%
Oregon	Separation	20,572	165	7.33%	3.76%	4.07%	2.77%
Oregon	Nonseparation	31,290	163	11.59%	5.50%	10.41%	5.23%
Pennsylvania	Monetary	71,507	153	11.57%	5.36%	9.18%	5.05%
Pennsylvania	Separation	65,505	153	11.15%	5.04%	8.68%	4.49%
Pennsylvania	Nonseparation	114,266	153	14.36%	5.82%	13.25%	5.61%
Puerto Rico	Monetary	1,305	36	82.65%	13.51%	38.13%	19.16%
Puerto Rico	Separation	3,392	61	1.09%	2.11%	0.00%	0.00%
Puerto Rico	Nonseparation	5,999	44	13.95%	18.35%	13.95%	18.35%
Rhode Island	Monetary	2,220	153	11.08%	5.50%	9.35%	4.98%
Rhode Island	Separation	5,290	152	4.29%	3.23%	3.62%	2.96%
Rhode Island	Nonseparation	7,848	153	9.09%	4.85%	8.69%	4.79%
South Carolina	Monetary	20,478	144	5.49%	3.59%	5.49%	3.59%
South Carolina	Separation	31,649	153	3.19%	2.89%	0.79%	1.54%
South Carolina	Nonseparation	84,557	157	1.46%	1.66%	1.00%	1.39%
South Dakota	Monetary	726	150	6.96%	4.43%	4.39%	3.88%
South Dakota	Separation	2,550	149	1.01%	1.34%	1.01%	1.34%
South Dakota	Nonseparation	3,447	150	4.42%	3.24%	3.84%	3.04%
Tennessee	Monetary	9,517	144	13.77%	5.84%	8.98%	4.21%
Tennessee	Separation	17,543	147	12.38%	5.55%	2.18%	2.15%
Tennessee	Nonseparation	44,588	148	13.76%	6.06%	7.78%	4.92%
Texas	Monetary	92,035	154	2.90%	2.12%	2.90%	2.12%
Texas	Separation	156,842	154	3.40%	2.32%	2.71%	1.88%
Texas	Nonseparation	281,764	153	0.62%	1.22%	0.62%	1.22%
Utah	Monetary	2,465	147	9.31%	4.95%	9.31%	4.95%
Utah	Separation	9,661	151	2.86%	2.95%	2.49%	2.86%
Utah	Nonseparation	39,458	150	6.25%	4.70%	5.60%	4.53%
Virginia	Monetary	9,659	150	11.64%	5.47%	8.48%	4.65%
Virginia	Separation	29,836	156	22.39%	6.38%	21.56%	6.38%
Virginia	Nonseparation	16,954	156	10.97%	5.05%	9.74%	4.88%

BENEFIT ACCURACY MEASUREMENT
DENIED CLAIMS ACCURACY
IMPROPER DENIAL RATES REPORT
Batch Range: 201727~201826

		Type		Adjusted			

State:	Denial Type	Population of Denials	Cases Completed*	Improper Denial	95% C.I (+/-)	Improper Denial**	95% C.I (+/-)
Vermont	Monetary	946	133	12.12%	6.27%	12.12%	6.27%
Vermont	Separation	2,891	150	7.39%	4.17%	4.61%	3.15%
Vermont	Nonseparation	3,507	151	6.85%	3.84%	6.85%	3.84%
Washington	Monetary	19,454	147	22.56%	7.76%	16.77%	6.93%
Washington	Separation	31,743	155	10.04%	5.09%	7.94%	4.44%
Washington	Nonseparation	106,113	154	20.32%	7.46%	11.63%	5.44%
Wisconsin	Monetary	7,867	149	14.62%	6.61%	14.62%	6.61%
Wisconsin	Separation	24,950	152	12.80%	5.80%	10.38%	5.06%
Wisconsin	Nonseparation	90,713	153	11.21%	5.39%	11.21%	5.39%
West Virginia	Monetary	993	122	24.36%	9.12%	16.17%	8.34%
West Virginia	Separation	9,972	151	4.59%	3.50%	3.58%	3.21%
West Virginia	Nonseparation	6,297	151	5.72%	3.71%	5.72%	3.71%
Wyoming	Monetary	1,397	144	9.59%	5.75%	9.59%	5.75%
Wyoming	Separation	2,831	150	9.14%	4.68%	6.65%	4.00%
Wyoming	Nonseparation	10,929	150	6.37%	4.00%	5.61%	3.72%

Note: 95% C.I. is the 95 percent confidence interval for the estimated rate. The interval is the range between the rate minus the value in the 95% C.I. column and the rate plus the value in the 95% C.I. column. For example, the interval for 10.0% +/- 2.5 is 7.5% to 12.5%. The true rate is expected to lie within 95 percent of the intervals constructed from repeated samples of the same size and selected in the same manner as the BAM DCA sample.

*Excludes cases not meeting DCA definition for inclusion in population, withdrawn claims, and claims for which monetary eligibility was established upon receipt of CWC, UCFE, and/or UCX wage credits.

**Adjusted rate excludes erroneous denials that were corrected by agency or reversed on appeal prior to DCA case completion.

PAID CLAIMS ACCURACY
CASE COMPLETION AND TIME LAPSE REPORT
Batch Range: 201727 ~ 201826

State	Cases Sampled	Cases Completed	Percent Completed	60 Day Time Lapse	90 Day Time Lapse
AK	482	482	100.00	93.98	98.96
AL	484	484	100.00	96.49	99.38
AR	481	481	100.00	93.97	99.38
AZ	480	480	100.00	97.29	98.75
CA	931	931	100.00	99.46	100.00
CO	480	480	100.00	79.17	95.83
CT	483	483	100.00	94.82	99.79
DC	364	364	100.00	89.84	99.73
DE	361	361	100.00	44.60 *	65.65 +
FL	470	470	100.00	99.15	99.57
GA	520	520	100.00	76.15	99.23
HI	364	364	100.00	93.13	98.35
IA	480	480	100.00	60.21 *	70.62 +
ID	485	485	100.00	95.26	99.79
IL	480	480	100.00	77.08	97.08
IN	481	481	100.00	93.56	96.47
KS	484	484	100.00	74.59	98.35
KY	520	520	100.00	19.23 *	43.46 +
LA	481	481	100.00	96.67	100.00
MA	488	488	100.00	72.34	95.70
MD	492	492	100.00	100.00	100.00
ME	481	481	100.00	80.87	98.13
MI	480	480	100.00	90.62	96.67
MN	483	483	100.00	95.24	100.00
MO	480	480	100.00	80.83	95.83
MS	498	498	100.00	90.96	99.60
MT	364	364	100.00	84.89	99.18
NC	520	520	100.00	80.96	96.15
ND	360	360	100.00	99.44	100.00
NE	361	361	100.00	98.61	100.00
NH	361	361	100.00	90.03	99.72
NJ	484	484	100.00	68.60 *	77.48 +
NM	480	480	100.00	96.88	99.79
NV	490	490	100.00	94.90	97.76

PAID CLAIMS ACCURACY
CASE COMPLETION AND TIME LAPSE REPORT
Batch Range: 201727 ~ 201826

State	Cases Sampled	Cases Completed	Percent Completed	60 Day Time Lapse	90 Day Time Lapse
NY	480	480	100.00	86.25	100.00
OH	481	481	100.00	94.18	99.17
OK	518	518	100.00	99.23	100.00
OR	481	481	100.00	96.05	100.00
PA	484	484	100.00	98.35	100.00
PR	232	154	66.38	12.07 *	38.36 +
RI	482	482	100.00	96.89	99.79
SC	512	512	100.00	99.22	100.00
SD	360	360	100.00	81.11	97.22
TN	485	485	100.00	73.40	97.94
TX	485	483	99.59	67.84 *	81.44 +
UT	481	481	100.00	97.09	100.00
VA	480	480	100.00	99.38	100.00
VT	361	361	100.00	81.44	97.23
WA	487	487	100.00	72.69	85.63 +
WI	483	483	100.00	85.09	97.10
WV	476	476	100.00	98.74	100.00
WY	359	359	100.00	89.69	96.94

Note: Time lapse has been adjusted for cases reopened with code '3'.

* Failed to meet 60 day time lapse standard of 70% complete.

\+ Failed to meet 90 day time lapse standard of 95% complete.

DENIED CLAIMS ACCURACY
CASE COMPLETION AND TIME LAPSE REPORT - DCA
Batch Range: 201727 ~ 201826

State	Denial Type	Cases Sampled	Cases Completed	Percent Completed	60 Day Time Lapse	90 Day Time Lapse
AK	Monetary	151	151	100	95.36	98.68
AK	Separation	151	151	100	98.68	100
AK	Nonseparation	151	151	100	99.34	100
AL	Monetary	151	151	100	99.34	100
AL	Separation	152	152	100	98.03	99.34
AL	Nonseparation	153	153	100	100	100
AR	Monetary	151	151	100	92.72	100
AR	Separation	151	151	100	98.68	100
AR	Nonseparation	151	151	100	94.04	100
AZ	Monetary	151	151	100	100	100
AZ	Separation	151	151	100	100	100
AZ	Nonseparation	150	150	100	98.67	98.67
CA	Monetary	259	259	100	98.84	100
CA	Separation	260	260	100	100	100
CA	Nonseparation	264	264	100	100	100
CO	Monetary	156	156	100	82.69	100
CO	Separation	154	154	100	91.56	99.35
CO	Nonseparation	153	153	100	88.24	98.69
CT	Monetary	155	155	100	99.35	99.35
CT	Separation	153	153	100	99.35	100
CT	Nonseparation	155	155	100	99.35	100
DC	Monetary	150	150	100	95.33	99.33
DC	Separation	156	156	100	94.23	100
DC	Nonseparation	156	156	100	98.08	99.36
DE	Monetary	173	173	100	57.23 *	79.77 +
DE	Separation	153	153	100	62.09	82.35 +
DE	Nonseparation	153	153	100	59.48 *	84.31 +
FL	Monetary	156	156	100	99.36	100
FL	Separation	156	156	100	99.36	100
FL	Nonseparation	157	154	98.09	96.82	98.09
GA	Monetary	156	156	100	68.59	99.36
GA	Separation	156	156	100	73.72	99.36
GA	Nonseparation	157	157	100	70.7	99.36
HI	Monetary	152	152	100	96.05	99.34
HI	Separation	156	156	100	98.08	100
HI	Nonseparation	156	156	100	96.79	99.36
IA	Monetary	153	153	100	78.43	84.31 +
IA	Separation	154	154	100	72.08	82.47 +
IA	Nonseparation	153	153	100	73.86	84.31 +

DENIED CLAIMS ACCURACY
CASE COMPLETION AND TIME LAPSE REPORT - DCA
Batch Range: 201727 ~ 201826

State	Denial Type	Cases Sampled	Cases Completed	Percent Completed	60 Day Time Lapse	90 Day Time Lapse
ID	Monetary	162	162	100	97.53	98.77
ID	Separation	152	152	100	100	100
ID	Nonseparation	151	151	100	100	100
IL	Monetary	154	154	100	70.13	97.4
IL	Separation	154	154	100	77.92	98.05
IL	Nonseparation	154	154	100	80.52	98.7
IN	Monetary	155	155	100	96.77	99.35
IN	Separation	151	151	100	98.01	99.34
IN	Nonseparation	151	151	100	97.35	98.68
KS	Monetary	159	159	100	84.91	100
KS	Separation	160	160	100	78.75	99.38
KS	Nonseparation	162	162	100	82.1	100
KY	Monetary	156	156	100	53.85 *	75.00 +
KY	Separation	156	156	100	98.08	100
KY	Nonseparation	190	190	100	32.63 *	62.63 +
LA	Monetary	153	153	100	93.46	100
LA	Separation	153	153	100	95.42	100
LA	Nonseparation	153	153	100	94.12	100
MA	Monetary	146	145	99.32	76.71	93.15
MA	Separation	147	147	100	84.35	95.92
MA	Nonseparation	147	147	100	83.67	97.28
MD	Monetary	157	157	100	100	100
MD	Separation	155	155	100	100	100
MD	Nonseparation	155	155	100	100	100
ME	Monetary	179	177	98.88	81.01	96.09
ME	Separation	160	160	100	90.62	100
ME	Nonseparation	157	157	100	89.81	100
MI	Monetary	152	152	100	90.79	96.71
MI	Separation	150	150	100	98.67	100
MI	Nonseparation	150	150	100	98	100
MN	Monetary	148	148	100	97.3	99.32
MN	Separation	151	151	100	97.35	100
MN	Nonseparation	151	151	100	98.01	100
MO	Monetary	150	150	100	89.33	97.33
MO	Separation	150	150	100	87.33	99.33
MO	Nonseparation	150	150	100	88	98
MS	Monetary	168	168	100	95.24	100
MS	Separation	168	168	100	97.02	100
MS	Nonseparation	168	168	100	96.43	100

DENIED CLAIMS ACCURACY

CASE COMPLETION AND TIME LAPSE REPORT - DCA

Batch Range: 201727 ~ 201826

State	Denial Type	Cases Sampled	Cases Completed	Percent Completed	60 Day Time Lapse	90 Day Time Lapse
MT	Monetary	157	156	99.36	94.9	99.36

MT	Separation	157	157	100	89.17	99.36
MT	Nonseparation	156	156	100	92.31	98.72
NC	Monetary	152	152	100	88.16	98.03
NC	Separation	156	156	100	96.79	100
NC	Nonseparation	156	156	100	92.95	99.36
ND	Monetary	151	151	100	100	100
ND	Separation	151	151	100	100	100
ND	Nonseparation	151	151	100	100	100
NE	Monetary	148	148	100	100	100
NE	Separation	151	151	100	100	100
NE	Nonseparation	150	150	100	99.33	100
NH	Monetary	152	152	100	95.39	99.34
NH	Separation	156	156	100	100	100
NH	Nonseparation	156	156	100	95.51	99.36
NJ	Monetary	154	154	100	70.78	76.62 +
NJ	Separation	153	153	100	72.55	76.47 +
NJ	Nonseparation	156	156	100	71.79	76.28 +
NM	Monetary	150	150	100	99.33	100
NM	Separation	152	152	100	98.68	100
NM	Nonseparation	149	149	100	99.33	100
NV	Monetary	153	153	100	98.69	100
NV	Separation	155	155	100	98.71	100
NV	Nonseparation	155	155	100	96.77	99.35
NY	Monetary	150	150	100	90.67	99.33
NY	Separation	150	150	100	90.67	100
NY	Nonseparation	149	149	100	92.62	100
OH	Monetary	150	150	100	96	99.33
OH	Separation	151	151	100	95.36	99.34
OH	Nonseparation	151	151	100	92.05	99.34
OK	Monetary	166	166	100	99.4	100
OK	Separation	166	166	100	100	100
OK	Nonseparation	167	167	100	100	100
OR	Monetary	157	157	100	98.09	99.36
OR	Separation	165	165	100	98.79	100
OR	Nonseparation	163	163	100	97.55	100
PA	Monetary	154	154	100	99.35	100
PA	Separation	153	153	100	100	100
PA	Nonseparation	153	153	100	100	100

DENIED CLAIMS ACCURACY

CASE COMPLETION AND TIME LAPSE REPORT - DCA

Batch Range: 201727 ~ 201826

State	Denial Type	Cases Sampled	Cases Completed	Percent Completed	60 Day Time Lapse	90 Day Time Lapse
PR	Monetary	67	41	61.19	22.39 *	37.31 +
PR	Separation	70	61	87.14	40.00 *	75.71 +
PR	Nonseparation	70	44	62.86	24.29 *	44.29 +
RI	Monetary	153	153	100	95.42	100

RI	Separation	152	152	100	98.68	100
RI	Nonseparation	153	153	100	99.35	100
SC	Monetary	156	156	100	100	100
SC	Separation	153	153	100	100	100
SC	Nonseparation	157	157	100	100	100
SD	Monetary	150	150	100	86.67	96.67
SD	Separation	149	149	100	89.93	100
SD	Nonseparation	150	150	100	92.67	100
TN	Monetary	148	148	100	87.84	100
TN	Separation	147	147	100	78.91	99.32
TN	Nonseparation	148	148	100	83.11	100
TX	Monetary	155	155	100	76.77	96.77
TX	Separation	154	154	100	86.36	98.05
TX	Nonseparation	153	153	100	87.58	97.39
UT	Monetary	151	151	100	96.03	99.34
UT	Separation	151	151	100	95.36	100
UT	Nonseparation	150	150	100	97.33	100
VA	Monetary	155	155	100	99.35	99.35
VA	Separation	156	156	100	99.36	100
VA	Nonseparation	156	156	100	100	100
VT	Monetary	151	150	99.34	96.69	99.34
VT	Separation	151	150	99.34	99.34	99.34
VT	Nonseparation	151	151	100	94.7	100
WA	Monetary	152	152	100	80.26	91.45
WA	Separation	155	155	100	79.35	92.26
WA	Nonseparation	154	154	100	85.06	94.81
WI	Monetary	153	153	100	92.81	99.35
WI	Separation	152	152	100	94.74	99.34
WI	Nonseparation	153	153	100	95.42	98.69
WV	Monetary	152	152	100	98.68	100
WV	Separation	151	151	100	100	100
WV	Nonseparation	151	151	100	100	100
WY	Monetary	150	150	100	94	99.33
WY	Separation	150	150	100	92.67	97.33
WY	Nonseparation	150	150	100	93.33	98

Note: Time lapse has been adjusted for cases reopened with code '3'.

* Failed to meet 60 day time lapse standard of 60% complete.

\+ Failed to meet 90 day time lapse standard of 85% complete.