

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, unknown payments, 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.¹ 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, availability for 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

¹ Some SWAs have updated the COBOL software edit and selection process as software programs and claimstaking processes have changed. ETA has published further guidance for states' updating these systems and monitored system changes. See UIPL No. 25-20; web published https://wdr.doleta.gov/directives/corr_doc.cfm?DOCN=6819; June 15, 2020.

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 (excluding the claimant Social Security Number and other personally identifying information) 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 type of 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 liable 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/offsets² 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”

² Offset of benefits are considered as being constructively received by the claimant.

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 (including CARES Act programs).

(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,
- Qualification 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 including CARES Act 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 (multi-claimant) 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,
- Identity theft/fraud, 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 including CARES act 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 202410 (March 3 - 9, 2024) 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 is specified 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 including email or other electronic method.

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 type 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, email, other electronic means, 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. The Payment Integrity Information Act (PIIA) of 2019 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 the 2023 reporting year. The PIIA shows different perspectives of results for BAM paid claims with 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 PIIA 2023 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 18,819 or 80.735 percent of the completed cases. 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 table below shows the number of cases with errors and the percentage of cases where improper payments were determined through either claimant response or non-response. Note that because BAM program staff are able to gather information from multiple sources such as claimants, employers and third parties to complete their investigations, claimant non-response does not significantly impact payment accuracy assessments nationally.

BAM Case Error Rates By Claimant Responsiveness
July 1, 2022 through June 30, 2023 (Batch Range 202227 through 202326)

ST	Claimant Response	Number Cases in Sample	Percent Response Rates	# Cases With Errors*	Percent cases Improper*
US	Responded	18,819	80.73%	2,626	13.95%
US	Nonresponse	4,492	19.27%	1,125	25.04%
US	Total Cases	23,311	100.00%	3,751	38.99%

* Overpayment Cause Counts and Percentages may reflect more than one payment error on a given case completed

In PIIA 2023, 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 PIIA 2023 BAM paid claims samples, and Attachment B-5 displays the response rates for the PIIA 2023 BAM denied claims samples.

<i>PIIA 2023-- BAM Case Completion and Percent of Claimant Interview Method</i>							

Sample Type	Cases Sampled	Valid Cases *	Cases Complete **	Percent Complete	In-Person	Tele-Phone	Mail	No Clmnt. Inter.
Paid Claims	23,919	23,869	23,111	96.82%	0.60%	33.66%	46.47%	19.27%
Monetary	8,034	7,687	7,469	97.16%	0.35%	23.70%	18.88%	56.74%
Separation	7,937	7,914	7,719	97.54%	0.44%	27.26%	22.64%	49.35%
Nonseparation	8,020	7,920	7,726	97.55%	0.44%	29.77%	26.38%	43.20%

* 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.

**To meet PIIA reporting timetables, the database was frozen on 10/31/2023. The number of valid cases completed is those signed off by the BAM program’s supervisor by the close of business on 10/30/2023.

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.

Daniel Sommers, Employment and Training Administration,
Office of Unemployment Insurance
Phone: 202-693-3197, E-mail: Sommers.Daniel@dol.gov

The following individual collects and analyzes 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:

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

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.)

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

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

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

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

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:

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

where:

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

$$\begin{aligned} x_{hik} &= x_{hi}, \text{ for } hi \text{ in the } k^{th} \text{ subgroup, and} \\ x_{hik} &= 0, \text{ for } hi \text{ not in the } k^{th} \text{ subgroup} \end{aligned}$$

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

$$\begin{aligned} y_{hik} &= y_{hi}, \text{ for } hi \text{ in the } k^{th} \text{ subgroup, and} \\ y_{hik} &= 0, \text{ for } hi \text{ not in the } k^{th} \text{ subgroup} \end{aligned}$$

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.)

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

where:

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

is the sample variance of the dollars overpaid in the kth subgroup;

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

is the sample variance of the dollars paid/offset in the kth subgroup; and

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

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

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

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

In the preceding formulas,

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

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

x_{hk} = Amount of UI benefits paid/offset in the kth 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:

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

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_{xh}^2 are defined as in 1. and 2., above;

s_{zh}^2 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 .

$$\begin{aligned} z_{hik} &= z_{hi}, \text{ for } h_i \text{ in the } k^{\text{th}} \text{ subgroup, and} \\ z_{hik} &= 0, \text{ for } h_i \text{ not in the } k^{\text{th}} \text{ subgroup} \end{aligned}$$

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.)

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

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

$s_{zh(k)}^2$ 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:

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

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_{xh}^2 are defined as in 1. and 2., above;

s_{uh}^2 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, except that:

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

$$\begin{aligned} u_{hik} &= u_{hi}, \text{ for } h_i \text{ in the } k^{\text{th}} \text{ subgroup, and} \\ u_{hik} &= 0, \text{ for } h_i \text{ not in the } k^{\text{th}} \text{ subgroup} \end{aligned}$$

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.)

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

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

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

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

Confidence Intervals

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

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

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

Coefficient of Variation

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

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

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

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:

$$P = X\bullet/N\bullet = \sum_{h=1}^H N_h P_h$$

Now let

m_h = the number of completed 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 $E(\hat{P}_h) = E(x_h/m_h) = X_h/N_h = P_h$.

$$\hat{P} = N \sum_{h=1}^H \hat{P}_h$$

It follows that \hat{P} 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

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

If f_h is negligible then

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

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

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

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

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

$$P_{\bullet k} = X_{\bullet k} / N_{\bullet k} = \frac{N_{\text{alignc}}^{-1} \sum_{h=1}^H \dot{c}_h N_{hk} P_{hk} \dot{c}_h}{N_{\bullet k}}$$

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 completed sample claims for week h .

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

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

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

$$\text{var}(\hat{P}_{\dot{c}_k}) \approx N_{\dot{c}_k}^{-2} \sum_{h=1}^H \dot{c}_h (1 - f_{hk}) \frac{N_{\text{alignc}}^2 \theta_{hk}}{m_h} P_{hk} (1 - P_{hk}) + (1 - \theta_{hk}) (P_{hk} - P_{\bullet k})^2$$

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

$$\hat{\text{var}}(\hat{P}_{\dot{c}_k}) = \{ \hat{N}_{\dot{c}_k}^{-2} \sum_{h=1}^H \dot{c}_h \frac{N_{\text{alignc}}^2 \hat{\theta}_{hk}}{(m_h - 1)} [\hat{P}_{hk} (1 - \hat{P}_{hk}) + (1 - \hat{\theta}_{hk}) (\hat{P}_{hk} - \hat{P}_{\bullet k})^2] \}$$

where

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

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

Confidence Intervals

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

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

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

Coefficient of Variation

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

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

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

UI Benefit Integrity Rates Batch Range 202227 through 202326

ST	Sample	Amount Paid	Over Payment Rate* (a)	OP Rate 95% CI +/-	Under Payment Rate* (b)	UP Rate 95% CI +/-	Improper Payment Rate (OP+UP) (a)+(b)	Fraud Rate	Fraud Rate 95% CI +/-	Agency Responsible Rate *	Agy Resp Rate 95% CI +/-
US	23,311	\$26,937,521,296	14.348%	0.952%	0.560%	0.131%	14.908%	5.346%	0.690%	3.316%	0.488%
AK	488	\$56,441,545	7.139%	2.251%	0.409%	0.250%	7.549%	3.462%	1.599%	0.666%	0.766%
AL	487	\$49,952,868	12.686%	3.374%	0.031%	0.033%	12.717%	3.441%	2.064%	1.816%	1.782%
AR	480	\$64,180,640	5.258%	1.919%	0.276%	0.225%	5.533%	2.007%	1.309%	1.601%	1.076%
AZ	481	\$225,729,177	4.504%	1.888%	0.033%	0.053%	4.537%	2.971%	1.529%	1.538%	1.156%
CA	480	\$5,573,215,035	14.750%	3.486%	0.678%	0.454%	15.428%	10.009%	2.851%	3.519%	1.872%
CO	481	\$338,885,203	4.576%	1.857%	0.911%	0.554%	5.487%	0.909%	0.857%	1.229%	0.924%
CT	490	\$362,266,432	16.719%	3.385%	0.153%	0.127%	16.872%	3.283%	1.685%	2.413%	1.419%
DC	490	\$64,672,527	21.711%	3.784%	0.114%	0.185%	21.825%	6.506%	2.361%	3.683%	1.689%
DE	37	\$23,121,198	22.082%	16.581%	0.342%	0.737%	22.424%	0.000%	0.000%	14.551%	14.319%
FL	485	\$351,159,636	39.174%	4.492%	0.000%	0.000%	39.174%	1.339%	1.072%	34.881%	4.391%
GA	484	\$322,164,794	7.413%	2.342%	0.000%	0.000%	7.413%	3.659%	1.724%	1.742%	1.157%
HI	407	\$150,268,241	6.411%	2.407%	0.080%	0.114%	6.491%	1.342%	1.019%	1.319%	1.137%
IA	322	\$279,864,392	3.871%	1.849%	0.002%	0.005%	3.873%	0.779%	0.853%	1.246%	1.149%
ID	363	\$101,547,658	6.418%	2.583%	0.198%	0.295%	6.617%	3.457%	1.850%	0.525%	0.630%
IL	490	\$1,643,819,101	9.219%	2.566%	0.924%	0.529%	10.143%	3.687%	1.727%	3.914%	1.778%
IN	491	\$229,339,969	8.722%	2.440%	0.037%	0.073%	8.759%	1.616%	0.888%	3.642%	1.658%
KS	465	\$101,479,845	15.502%	3.490%	0.283%	0.297%	15.786%	1.393%	1.116%	2.235%	1.487%
KY	504	\$132,621,904	21.495%	3.677%	0.898%	0.561%	22.393%	5.444%	2.097%	0.204%	0.239%
LA	491	\$101,828,337	16.281%	3.373%	0.004%	0.006%	16.284%	6.664%	2.207%	5.519%	2.047%
MA	439	\$1,738,560,024	23.348%	4.366%	1.033%	0.651%	24.380%	10.891%	3.026%	5.904%	2.335%
MD	487	\$305,032,730	10.407%	2.955%	0.033%	0.066%	10.441%	2.165%	1.296%	2.532%	1.570%
ME	356	\$89,556,584	5.585%	2.501%	0.298%	0.270%	5.884%	2.087%	1.544%	1.741%	1.640%
MI	482	\$639,025,986	21.485%	4.115%	0.150%	0.177%	21.635%	2.602%	1.708%	2.688%	1.499%
MN	484	\$958,208,258	7.420%	2.323%	0.142%	0.195%	7.563%	3.110%	1.746%	0.364%	0.544%

UI Benefit Integrity Rates Batch Range 202227 through 202326

Attachment B-2

ST	Sample	Amount Paid	Over Payment Rate* (a)	OP Rate 95% CI +/-	Under Payment Rate* (b)	UP Rate 95% CI +/-	Improper Payment Rate (OP+UP) (a)+(b)	Fraud Rate	Fraud Rate 95% CI +/-	Agency Responsible Rate *	Agy Resp Rate 95% CI +/-
MO	480	\$181,028,220	5.471%	2.241%	0.072%	0.095%	5.543%	1.591%	1.179%	0.644%	0.594%
MS	481	\$38,369,336	6.817%	2.626%	0.000%	0.000%	6.817%	4.099%	2.144%	0.424%	0.609%
MT	369	\$97,574,433	6.772%	3.087%	0.404%	0.370%	7.176%	2.763%	1.990%	1.450%	1.717%
NC	530	\$171,178,347	18.546%	3.483%	0.135%	0.253%	18.681%	1.856%	1.119%	0.686%	0.649%
ND	362	\$60,965,151	6.755%	3.786%	0.041%	0.059%	6.797%	0.201%	0.408%	0.000%	0.000%
NE	360	\$60,727,001	16.256%	3.911%	0.265%	0.363%	16.521%	1.858%	1.289%	4.646%	2.156%
NH	371	\$26,924,233	7.155%	2.853%	0.374%	0.277%	7.529%	1.264%	1.125%	1.819%	1.556%
NJ	493	\$2,100,389,810	21.029%	3.693%	1.406%	0.558%	22.435%	3.256%	1.619%	0.516%	0.571%
NM	468	\$125,741,614	8.794%	2.957%	0.045%	0.055%	8.839%	1.834%	1.411%	1.512%	1.322%
NV	530	\$294,777,448	16.691%	3.231%	0.492%	0.480%	17.183%	4.149%	1.683%	5.070%	1.951%
NY	480	\$2,527,452,155	16.644%	3.406%	0.722%	0.558%	17.366%	6.971%	2.252%	4.185%	1.859%
OH	480	\$684,059,467	8.030%	2.450%	0.421%	0.325%	8.451%	1.502%	0.984%	0.917%	0.836%
OK	506	\$172,406,440	10.919%	2.731%	0.305%	0.423%	11.224%	2.096%	1.242%	8.176%	2.406%
OR	480	\$568,284,659	10.356%	2.768%	0.830%	0.537%	11.186%	4.543%	1.871%	2.326%	1.363%
PA	482	\$1,479,945,992	15.284%	3.421%	0.374%	0.606%	15.658%	9.601%	2.689%	3.925%	1.962%
PR	484	\$142,660,874	7.932%	2.441%	0.340%	0.264%	8.273%	3.386%	1.693%	6.860%	2.245%
RI	330	\$156,130,225	44.939%	7.574%	0.427%	0.422%	45.366%	6.033%	3.192%	5.334%	2.895%
SC	491	\$118,493,243	7.499%	2.274%	0.000%	0.000%	7.499%	1.190%	0.988%	1.825%	1.176%
SD	360	\$25,386,200	7.228%	2.799%	0.195%	0.237%	7.424%	1.363%	1.383%	2.172%	1.792%
TN	480	\$137,063,260	19.962%	3.611%	0.000%	0.000%	19.962%	4.004%	1.816%	6.300%	2.305%

UI Benefit Integrity Rates Batch Range 202227 through 202326

ST	Sample	Amount Paid	Over Payment Rate* (a)	OP Rate 95% CI +/-	Under Payment Rate* (b)	UP Rate 95% CI +/-	Improper Payment Rate (OP+UP) (a)+(b)	Fraud Rate	Fraud Rate 95% CI +/-	Agency Responsible Rate *	Agy Resp Rate 95% CI +/-
TX	481	\$1,805,818,109	7.935%	2.678%	0.053%	0.052%	7.987%	0.302%	0.339%	0.886%	0.967%
UT	481	\$194,363,549	3.905%	1.801%	0.062%	0.064%	3.966%	1.468%	1.245%	0.822%	0.877%
VA	505	\$200,864,799	20.451%	3.522%	0.161%	0.182%	20.611%	1.954%	1.149%	6.902%	2.204%
VT	360	\$54,208,487	7.055%	2.637%	0.179%	0.162%	7.234%	2.014%	1.686%	1.089%	0.820%
WA	472	\$1,147,466,807	9.861%	3.083%	0.172%	0.180%	10.034%	0.458%	0.802%	1.770%	1.299%
WI	482	\$299,324,808	20.879%	4.035%	0.392%	0.418%	21.272%	2.687%	1.453%	2.747%	1.677%
WV	489	\$118,702,586	7.067%	2.375%	0.836%	0.530%	7.903%	1.015%	0.859%	1.609%	1.184%
WY	360	\$44,271,959	9.886%	3.153%	0.377%	0.262%	10.263%	2.318%	1.563%	1.532%	1.248%

Denied Claims Accuracy Rates -- PIIA Reporting Year 2023							
July 1, 2022 through June 30, 2023							
st	Sample Type	Sample* of denial Type	Population of denial Type	Improper Denial	95% C.I. (+/-)	Adjusted Improper Denial#	95% C.I. (+/-)
US	Monetary	7,469	1,430,307	11.26%	0.78%	9.58%	0.71%
US	Separation	7,719	1,406,929	11.05%	0.65%	9.36%	0.58%
US	Nonseparation	7,726	3,296,361	12.94%	0.69%	10.79%	0.64%
AK	Monetary	149	2,538	10.21%	4.50%	6.81%	3.62%
AK	Separation	159	7,097	8.15%	3.92%	8.15%	3.92%
AK	Nonseparation	159	24,210	12.11%	5.03%	12.11%	5.03%
AL	Monetary	158	20,424	20.38%	2.06%	20.38%	2.06%
AL	Separation	158	19,121	3.03%	3.03%	3.03%	3.03%
AL	Nonseparation	157	68,545	4.05%	4.48%	3.68%	4.42%
AR	Monetary	151	4,783	4.76%	3.18%	3.78%	2.56%
AR	Separation	150	10,808	3.28%	3.31%	2.68%	3.10%
AR	Nonseparation	150	16,003	1.85%	2.15%	1.85%	2.15%
AZ	Monetary	148	38,421	4.00%	3.57%	3.44%	3.40%
AZ	Separation	151	21,000	12.99%	5.85%	12.99%	5.85%
AZ	Nonseparation	151	25,622	15.15%	5.56%	15.15%	5.56%
CA	Monetary	134	157,362	25.58%	7.75%	20.33%	7.72%
CA	Separation	136	191,081	23.06%	7.61%	23.06%	7.61%
CA	Nonseparation	128	266,735	36.38%	9.01%	28.07%	8.49%
CO	Monetary	149	16,108	15.06%	6.05%	14.38%	5.91%
CO	Separation	151	61,684	10.99%	7.46%	8.89%	6.75%
CO	Nonseparation	151	99,966	11.63%	6.41%	11.09%	6.33%
CT	Monetary	157	9,398	51.09%	9.86%	47.73%	9.77%

CT	Separation	156	19,469	8.67%	4.06%	7.66%	3.55%
CT	Nonseparation	152	52,143	18.07%	6.21%	15.38%	5.78%
DC	Monetary	145	4,799	29.50%	12.05%	27.64%	11.83%
DC	Separation	159	1,464	10.91%	4.79%	8.17%	4.61%
DC	Nonseparation	159	27,646	7.23%	3.65%	6.42%	3.51%

**Denied Claims Accuracy Rates -- PIIA Reporting Year 2023
July 1, 2022 through June 30, 2023**

st	Sample Type	Sample* of denial Type	Population of denial Type	Improper Denial	95% C.I. (+/-)	Adjusted Improper Denial#	95% C.I. (+/-)
DE	Monetary	9	748	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
DE	Separation	7	583	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
DE	Nonseparation	8	1,051	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
FL	Monetary	153	41,125	4.38%	4.18%	4.38%	4.18%
FL	Separation	155	4,165	10.80%	5.50%	9.82%	5.29%
FL	Nonseparation	155	32,953	9.45%	7.94%	8.49%	7.93%
GA	Monetary	146	14,267	34.81%	8.57%	34.81%	8.57%
GA	Separation	152	57,979	2.29%	2.68%	2.29%	2.68%
GA	Nonseparation	153	75,696	0.71%	1.40%	0.71%	1.40%
HI	Monetary	135	5,561	10.45%	7.88%	10.17%	7.86%
HI	Separation	136	5,371	15.54%	7.18%	11.38%	6.14%
HI	Nonseparation	134	18,651	8.66%	4.84%	8.66%	4.84%
IA	Monetary	121	6,063	22.30%	7.27%	20.79%	7.29%
IA	Separation	134	13,204	10.70%	4.83%	8.96%	4.57%
IA	Nonseparation	136	22,518	4.31%	3.23%	1.96%	2.22%

ID	Monetary	150	2,330	6.84%	3.99%	4.23%	3.09%
ID	Separation	153	5,481	4.33%	3.08%	4.33%	3.08%
ID	Nonseparation	153	28,041	10.45%	5.25%	10.45%	5.25%
IL	Monetary	153	17,461	16.42%	6.52%	13.94%	6.41%
IL	Separation	158	63,861	14.93%	5.53%	8.56%	4.53%
IL	Nonseparation	158	151,310	20.83%	6.72%	19.27%	6.48%
IN	Monetary	159	60,667	1.38%	1.96%	1.38%	1.96%
IN	Separation	159	39,310	10.98%	4.64%	9.55%	4.42%
IN	Nonseparation	158	120,540	6.51%	3.87%	6.51%	3.87%
KS	Monetary	137	5,701	7.32%	4.20%	6.27%	3.67%
KS	Separation	144	10,847	6.80%	4.29%	5.16%	3.63%
KS	Nonseparation	141	20,591	8.80%	4.55%	8.39%	4.48%
KY	Monetary	157	8,812	11.25%	5.27%	5.04%	3.31%
KY	Separation	156	26,595	2.45%	2.43%	2.45%	2.43%
KY	Nonseparation	188	51,102	8.72%	3.88%	7.92%	3.58%

Denied Claims Accuracy Rates -- PIIA Reporting Year 2023

July 1, 2022 through June 30, 2023

St	Sample Type	Sample* of denial Type	Population of denial Type	Improper Denial	95% C.I. (+/-)	Adjusted Improper Denial#	95% C.I. (+/-)
LA	Monetary	159	20,503	2.27%	2.24%	2.27%	2.24%
LA	Separation	159	16,800	6.60%	3.87%	4.42%	3.23%
LA	Nonseparation	159	39,974	5.37%	3.66%	2.97%	2.44%
MA	Monetary	137	182,410	7.49%	2.56%	6.92%	2.47%
MA	Separation	134	29,783	26.47%	9.12%	23.87%	8.82%
MA	Nonseparation	133	101,330	23.78%	8.36%	23.33%	8.31%

MD	Monetary	144	57,967	19.26%	8.53%	16.72%	8.23%
MD	Separation	145	14,503	12.50%	5.99%	11.39%	5.58%
MD	Nonseparation	148	44,756	3.53%	2.56%	2.96%	2.42%
ME	Monetary	143	2,542	13.40%	5.03%	11.11%	5.04%
ME	Separation	145	4,520	6.99%	4.30%	2.78%	2.50%
ME	Nonseparation	146	12,530	12.27%	4.98%	11.87%	4.95%
MI	Monetary	152	64,552	7.49%	4.51%	6.97%	4.40%
MI	Separation	151	86,947	13.34%	5.07%	8.35%	4.63%
MI	Nonseparation	151	348,068	9.76%	4.56%	5.54%	3.61%
MN	Monetary	153	15,776	15.67%	6.86%	15.67%	6.86%
MN	Separation	153	21,984	10.17%	4.82%	4.01%	3.31%
MN	Nonseparation	153	63,768	6.02%	4.00%	5.33%	3.77%
MO	Monetary	151	18,902	1.47%	2.03%	1.47%	2.03%
MO	Separation	151	31,528	5.70%	3.95%	2.12%	2.40%
MO	Nonseparation	151	69,058	13.93%	5.51%	7.51%	4.75%
MS	Monetary	153	7,809	3.17%	2.79%	2.68%	2.62%
MS	Separation	152	15,704	3.82%	3.21%	2.71%	2.36%
MS	Nonseparation	154	36,400	3.62%	3.03%	3.36%	2.99%
MT	Monetary	139	1,509	1.75%	1.97%	1.13%	1.60%
MT	Separation	156	3,851	3.43%	2.75%	2.14%	2.05%
MT	Nonseparation	156	8,983	6.44%	3.80%	1.46%	2.02%

Denied Claims Accuracy Rates -- PIIA Reporting Year 2023							
July 1, 2022 through June 30, 2023							
	Sample	Sample* of denial	Population of denial	Improper	95% C.I.	Adjusted Improper	95% C.I.

st	Type	Type	Type	Denial	(+/-)	Denial#	(+/-)
NC	Monetary	152	24,739	13.13%	4.98%	11.27%	4.64%
NC	Separation	159	27,930	4.10%	3.05%	2.91%	2.56%
NC	Nonseparation	159	54,088	16.49%	6.03%	15.83%	5.89%
ND	Monetary	154	2,102	2.63%	2.21%	2.11%	1.98%
ND	Separation	151	3,156	16.89%	6.31%	8.14%	4.55%
ND	Nonseparation	151	8,319	7.02%	3.93%	4.65%	3.51%
NE	Monetary	149	3,821	8.08%	3.49%	6.34%	2.91%
NE	Separation	149	5,689	17.61%	6.83%	12.41%	5.58%
NE	Nonseparation	155	24,698	16.09%	5.81%	9.61%	4.61%
NH	Monetary	156	1,059	15.23%	5.34%	6.36%	3.51%
NH	Separation	159	2,423	3.60%	3.09%	2.74%	2.61%
NH	Nonseparation	155	15,107	23.16%	6.92%	11.57%	5.33%
NJ	Monetary	153	46,559	9.19%	4.62%	6.72%	4.05%
NJ	Separation	158	56,597	6.60%	3.92%	6.60%	3.92%
NJ	Nonseparation	159	60,280	7.49%	4.11%	7.49%	4.11%
NM	Monetary	151	9,253	15.81%	5.99%	14.65%	5.99%
NM	Separation	156	3,908	9.38%	3.94%	6.00%	3.03%
NM	Nonseparation	156	24,648	1.87%	1.87%	0.98%	1.16%
NV	Monetary	145	10,097	12.42%	5.81%	11.91%	5.72%
NV	Separation	159	40,676	13.60%	5.37%	12.86%	5.37%
NV	Nonseparation	154	90,709	8.34%	4.07%	7.76%	3.90%
NY	Monetary	139	68,181	17.26%	7.03%	16.05%	6.97%
NY	Separation	150	52,598	5.32%	3.54%	5.32%	3.54%
NY	Nonseparation	150	110,179	3.71%	3.01%	2.99%	2.66%
OH	Monetary	150	137,918	3.53%	2.48%	2.15%	1.89%

OH	Separation	150	27,061	7.84%	4.33%	7.02%	4.03%
OH	Nonseparation	150	82,387	11.45%	5.01%	7.17%	3.99%
OK	Monetary	154	25,029	2.14%	1.75%	1.96%	1.71%
OK	Separation	159	17,433	3.09%	2.74%	1.17%	1.64%
OK	Nonseparation	159	28,087	1.71%	2.77%	1.38%	2.69%

**Denied Claims Accuracy Rates -- PIA Reporting Year 2023
July 1, 2022 through June 30, 2023**

St	Sample Type	Sample* of denial Type	Population of denial Type	Improper Denial	95% C.I. (+/-)	Adjusted Improper Denial#	95% C.I. (+/-)
OR	Monetary	147	16,350	24.42%	8.00%	21.18%	7.42%
OR	Separation	163	21,429	7.85%	4.16%	7.85%	4.16%
OR	Nonseparation	149	53,206	6.28%	3.75%	4.49%	3.13%
PA	Monetary	152	65,099	13.32%	4.87%	9.06%	4.01%
PA	Separation	152	45,916	18.94%	6.46%	14.88%	6.29%
PA	Nonseparation	152	126,153	14.77%	6.26%	12.21%	5.96%
PR	Monetary	136	8,348	13.41%	11.55%	10.90%	11.39%
PR	Separation	151	6,335	0.56%	1.09%	0.56%	1.09%
PR	Nonseparation	150	8,876	2.72%	2.66%	1.31%	1.80%
RI	Monetary	112	3,114	14.24%	6.56%	11.72%	6.14%
RI	Separation	111	4,575	12.49%	5.86%	10.29%	5.30%
RI	Nonseparation	115	6,662	7.04%	5.21%	7.04%	5.21%
SC	Monetary	152	17,090	4.59%	3.28%	3.80%	2.90%
SC	Separation	153	31,024	5.46%	3.84%	2.55%	2.50%
SC	Nonseparation	153	83,089	8.26%	4.80%	4.68%	3.54%

SD	Monetary	150	597	8.46%	4.73%	2.96%	3.27%
SD	Separation	154	2,134	0.50%	0.93%	0.00%	0.00%
SD	Nonseparation	153	3,100	10.77%	5.55%	7.29%	4.19%
TN	Monetary	146	17,862	4.38%	3.27%	4.38%	3.27%
TN	Separation	150	16,424	7.18%	4.50%	2.96%	3.24%
TN	Nonseparation	150	28,450	17.53%	6.49%	13.53%	5.96%
TX	Monetary	151	114,774	4.73%	3.28%	4.73%	3.28%
TX	Separation	152	159,360	5.34%	3.71%	4.67%	3.46%
TX	Nonseparation	152	214,783	5.55%	3.93%	4.94%	3.74%
UT	Monetary	145	7,926	4.68%	3.32%	3.76%	2.80%
UT	Separation	153	12,154	0.70%	1.35%	0.70%	1.35%
UT	Nonseparation	151	68,056	3.21%	2.89%	3.21%	2.89%

Denied Claims Accuracy Rates -- PIIA Reporting Year 2023 July 1, 2022 through June 30, 2023							
st	Sample Type	Sample* of denial Type	Population of denial Type	Improper Denial	95% C.I. (+/-)	Adjusted Improper Denial#	95% C.I. (+/-)
VA	Monetary	137	14,124	9.35%	5.20%	6.33%	4.30%
VA	Separation	159	22,616	18.37%	6.62%	18.37%	6.62%
VA	Nonseparation	159	83,480	13.28%	7.55%	13.28%	7.55%
VT	Monetary	129	1,483	45.35%	8.32%	38.95%	7.74%
VT	Separation	150	1,880	16.24%	7.11%	13.67%	6.53%
VT	Nonseparation	150	2,803	10.28%	4.05%	9.81%	3.95%
WA	Monetary	142	33,619	16.07%	6.43%	11.66%	5.42%
WA	Separation	145	26,110	11.55%	5.78%	9.92%	5.29%
WA	Nonseparation	147	149,112	27.34%	7.74%	26.06%	7.74%

WI	Monetary	149	9,673	10.09%	5.59%	10.09%	5.59%
WI	Separation	152	24,252	11.85%	5.44%	7.94%	4.58%
WI	Nonseparation	151	121,311	14.40%	6.13%	14.40%	6.13%
WV	Monetary	135	1,451	17.80%	6.65%	12.23%	6.09%
WV	Separation	154	8,611	7.61%	4.24%	4.80%	3.60%
WV	Nonseparation	154	8,958	7.05%	4.00%	7.05%	4.00%
WY	Monetary	141	1,500	17.89%	7.66%	10.87%	5.27%
WY	Separation	150	1,898	7.64%	4.10%	2.07%	2.27%
WY	Nonseparation	150	11,629	2.59%	2.17%	2.59%	2.17%

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 (PCA) CASE COMPLETION AND TIME LAPSE REPORT <i>Batch Range: 202227 ~ 202326</i>					
State	Cases Sampled	Cases Completed	Percent Completed	60 Day Time Lapse	90 Day Time Lapse
AK	488	488	100.00	95.70	99.18
AL	487	487	100.00	85.22	97.74
AR	480	480	100.00	82.29	97.08
AZ	481	481	100.00	58.63 *	77.75 +
CA	480	480	100.00	95.21	99.38
CO	481	481	100.00	66.94 *	85.03 +
CT	490	490	100.00	87.35	97.76
DC	490	490	100.00	91.84	99.18
DE	367	37	10.08	0.00 *	1.63 +
FL	485	485	100.00	94.43	99.59
GA	484	484	100.00	84.50	98.76
HI	407	407	100.00	90.42	95.82
IA	480	322	67.08	3.54 *	7.29 +
ID	363	363	100.00	94.21	98.62
IL	490	490	100.00	60.41 *	81.22 +
IN	491	491	100.00	96.33	98.78
KS	465	465	100.00	70.11	94.84 +
KY	504	504	100.00	30.56 *	53.77 +
LA	491	491	100.00	98.17	100.00
MA	508	440	86.61	46.65 *	68.11 +
MD	487	487	100.00	68.79 *	89.73 +
ME	356	356	100.00	90.45	97.75
MI	482	482	100.00	94.40	98.55
MN	484	484	100.00	87.81	95.45
MO	480	480	100.00	91.88	97.50
MS	481	481	100.00	97.51	100.00
MT	369	369	100.00	95.12	99.73
NC	530	530	100.00	80.38	97.17
ND	362	362	100.00	96.69	100.00
NE	360	360	100.00	93.89	99.44
NH	371	371	100.00	88.14	97.57
NJ	493	493	100.00	78.09	96.55
NM	468	468	100.00	74.36	97.01
NV	530	530	100.00	81.51	96.42

PAID CLAIMS ACCURACY (PCA) CASE COMPLETION AND TIME LAPSE REPORT <i>Batch Range: 202227 ~ 202326</i>					
State	Cases Sampled	Cases Completed	Percent Completed	60 Day Time Lapse	90 Day Time Lapse
NY	480	480	100.00	76.88	96.25
OH	480	480	100.00	81.67	98.12
OK	506	506	100.00	99.80	100.00
OR	480	480	100.00	87.71	99.17
PA	482	482	100.00	97.72	99.79
PR	484	484	100.00	23.76 *	62.81 +
RI	330	330	100.00	73.03	93.03 +
SC	491	491	100.00	93.08	99.80
SD	360	360	100.00	94.44	99.17
TN	480	480	100.00	84.17	98.12
TX	481	481	100.00	88.98	99.17
UT	481	481	100.00	94.18	99.58
VA	505	505	100.00	98.61	100.00
VT	360	360	100.00	93.06	99.72
WA	472	472	100.00	72.67	90.04 +
WI	482	482	100.00	68.67 *	92.12 +
WV	490	489	99.80	91.43	99.80
WY	360	360	100.00	89.44	98.06

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.

The Benefit Accuracy Measurement program was suspended due to Covid-19 epidemic excluding data for batch range 202014 through 202026. As a result case completion timeliness was negatively impacted

DENIED CLAIMS ACCURACY (DCA)						
CASE COMPLETION AND TIME LAPSE REPORT - DCA Batch Range: 202227 ~ 202326						
State	Denial Type	Cases Sampled	Cases Completed	Percent Completed	60 Day Time Lapse	90 Day Time Lapse
AK	Monetary	155	155	100.00	96.77	100.00
AK	Separation	159	159	100.00	96.23	100.00
AK	Nonseparation	159	159	100.00	97.48	100.00
AL	Monetary	158	158	100.00	82.28	96.20
AL	Separation	158	158	100.00	81.01	98.10
AL	Nonseparation	157	157	100.00	99.36	99.36
AR	Monetary	155	155	100.00	88.39	99.35
AR	Separation	150	150	100.00	91.33	98.00
AR	Nonseparation	150	150	100.00	88.67	98.00
AZ	Monetary	151	151	100.00	74.83	85.43
AZ	Separation	151	151	100.00	74.83	89.40
AZ	Nonseparation	151	151	100.00	76.16	90.07
CA	Monetary	138	138	100.00	92.03	100.00
CA	Separation	136	136	100.00	98.53	100.00
CA	Nonseparation	128	128	100.00	96.09	100.00
CO	Monetary	151	151	100.00	69.54	86.09
CO	Separation	151	151	100.00	70.86	86.09
CO	Nonseparation	151	151	100.00	74.17	86.09
CT	Monetary	157	157	100.00	94.90	98.73
CT	Separation	156	156	100.00	100.00	100.00
CT	Nonseparation	152	152	100.00	100.00	100.00
DC	Monetary	160	160	100.00	91.88	98.75
DC	Separation	159	159	100.00	94.97	98.74
DC	Nonseparation	159	159	100.00	93.71	98.11
DE	Monetary	155	9	5.81	0.65 *	1.94 +
DE	Separation	155	7	4.52	0.65 *	2.58 +
DE	Nonseparation	155	9	5.81	0.65 *	2.58 +
FL	Monetary	153	153	100.00	98.69	99.35
FL	Separation	155	155	100.00	97.42	100.00
FL	Nonseparation	155	155	100.00	98.71	100.00
GA	Monetary	151	150	99.34	83.44	99.34
GA	Separation	152	152	100.00	92.76	99.34
GA	Nonseparation	154	153	99.35	89.61	99.35
HI	Monetary	135	135	100.00	98.52	100.00
HI	Separation	136	136	100.00	94.85	100.00
HI	Nonseparation	134	134	100.00	97.76	100.00
IA	Monetary	154	121	78.57	10.39 *	16.23 +
IA	Separation	154	134	87.01	8.44 *	20.78 +
IA	Nonseparation	154	136	88.31	8.44 *	22.73 +

DENIED CLAIMS ACCURACY (DCA)
CASE COMPLETION AND TIME LAPSE REPORT - DCA Batch Range: 202227 ~ 202326

State	Denial Type	Cases Sampled	Cases Completed	Percent Completed	60 Day Time Lapse	90 Day Time Lapse
ID	Monetary	154	154	100.00	90.26	98.70
ID	Separation	153	153	100.00	93.46	100.00
ID	Nonseparation	153	153	100.00	97.39	100.00
IL	Monetary	158	158	100.00	68.99	88.61
IL	Separation	158	158	100.00	71.52	91.14
IL	Nonseparation	158	158	100.00	64.56	85.44
IN	Monetary	159	159	100.00	100.00	100.00
IN	Separation	159	159	100.00	100.00	100.00
IN	Nonseparation	158	158	100.00	99.37	100.00
KS	Monetary	142	142	100.00	76.76	98.59
KS	Separation	144	144	100.00	76.39	97.92
KS	Nonseparation	141	141	100.00	79.43	98.58
KY	Monetary	157	157	100.00	96.18	99.36
KY	Separation	156	156	100.00	75.00	99.36
KY	Nonseparation	188	188	100.00	99.47	100.00
LA	Monetary	159	159	100.00	100.00	100.00
LA	Separation	159	159	100.00	99.37	100.00
LA	Nonseparation	159	159	100.00	99.37	100.00
MA	Monetary	154	137	88.96	62.99	78.57 +
MA	Separation	154	134	87.01	60.39	77.92 +
MA	Nonseparation	153	133	86.93	59.48 *	77.78 +
MD	Monetary	144	144	100.00	58.33 *	86.81
MD	Separation	145	145	100.00	66.90	87.59
MD	Nonseparation	148	148	100.00	58.78 *	87.84
ME	Monetary	145	144	99.31	91.03	97.24
ME	Separation	145	145	100.00	97.24	100.00
ME	Nonseparation	146	146	100.00	97.95	99.32
MI	Monetary	152	152	100.00	94.74	99.34
MI	Separation	151	151	100.00	93.38	100.00
MI	Nonseparation	151	151	100.00	92.72	99.34
MN	Monetary	153	153	100.00	99.35	100.00
MN	Separation	153	153	100.00	100.00	100.00
MN	Nonseparation	153	153	100.00	98.69	99.35
MO	Monetary	151	151	100.00	96.03	99.34
MO	Separation	151	151	100.00	97.35	99.34
MO	Nonseparation	151	151	100.00	96.03	98.68
MS	Monetary	153	153	100.00	100.00	100.00
MS	Separation	152	152	100.00	99.34	100.00
MS	Nonseparation	154	154	100.00	99.35	100.00

DENIED CLAIMS ACCURACY (DCA)

CASE COMPLETION AND TIME LAPSE REPORT - DCA Batch Range: 202227 ~ 202326

State	Denial Type	Cases Sampled	Cases Completed	Percent Completed	60 Day Time Lapse	90 Day Time Lapse
MT	Monetary	155	155	100.00	95.48	98.71

MT	Separation	156	156	100.00	97.44	100.00
MT	Nonseparation	156	156	100.00	96.15	100.00
NC	Monetary	158	158	100.00	87.34	99.37
NC	Separation	159	159	100.00	91.19	99.37
NC	Nonseparation	159	159	100.00	87.42	99.37
ND	Monetary	158	158	100.00	98.10	100.00
ND	Separation	151	151	100.00	98.01	100.00
ND	Nonseparation	151	151	100.00	100.00	100.00
NE	Monetary	149	149	100.00	96.64	100.00
NE	Separation	149	149	100.00	94.63	100.00
NE	Nonseparation	155	155	100.00	94.84	100.00
NH	Monetary	156	156	100.00	96.79	100.00
NH	Separation	159	159	100.00	98.74	99.37
NH	Nonseparation	156	155	99.36	97.44	98.72
NJ	Monetary	159	159	100.00	85.53	100.00
NJ	Separation	159	158	99.37	83.02	98.74
NJ	Nonseparation	159	159	100.00	84.91	98.74
NM	Monetary	153	153	100.00	71.24	96.08
NM	Separation	156	156	100.00	73.08	95.51
NM	Nonseparation	156	156	100.00	82.05	98.08
NV	Monetary	158	154	97.47	85.44	96.84
NV	Separation	159	159	100.00	86.79	98.11
NV	Nonseparation	157	154	98.09	77.07	92.36
NY	Monetary	150	150	100.00	76.00	92.67
NY	Separation	150	150	100.00	81.33	95.33
NY	Nonseparation	150	150	100.00	82.67	96.00
OH	Monetary	150	150	100.00	87.33	100.00
OH	Separation	150	150	100.00	84.67	98.00
OH	Nonseparation	150	150	100.00	76.00	95.33
OK	Monetary	156	156	100.00	98.08	100.00
OK	Separation	159	159	100.00	99.37	100.00
OK	Nonseparation	159	159	100.00	100.00	100.00
OR	Monetary	163	163	100.00	88.96	96.32
OR	Separation	163	163	100.00	91.41	100.00
OR	Nonseparation	149	149	100.00	90.60	99.33
PA	Monetary	152	152	100.00	99.34	100.00
PA	Separation	152	152	100.00	97.37	100.00
PA	Nonseparation	152	152	100.00	99.34	100.00

DENIED CLAIMS ACCURACY

CASE COMPLETION AND TIME LAPSE REPORT - DCA Batch Range: 202227 ~ 202326

State	Denial Type	Cases Sampled	Cases Completed	Percent Completed	60 Day Time Lapse	90 Day Time Lapse
PR	Monetary	150	150	100.00	40.00 *	75.33 +
PR	Separation	151	151	100.00	67.55	94.04
PR	Nonseparation	150	150	100.00	27.33 *	64.00 +
RI	Monetary	116	112	96.55	70.69	90.52

RI	Separation	116	111	95.69	62.93	86.21
RI	Nonseparation	117	115	98.29	71.79	88.03
SC	Monetary	152	152	100.00	96.71	99.34
SC	Separation	153	153	100.00	98.04	100.00
SC	Nonseparation	153	153	100.00	99.35	100.00
SD	Monetary	151	151	100.00	98.01	100.00
SD	Separation	154	154	100.00	98.05	100.00
SD	Nonseparation	153	153	100.00	94.77	100.00
TN	Monetary	150	150	100.00	94.00	100.00
TN	Separation	150	150	100.00	90.00	100.00
TN	Nonseparation	150	150	100.00	93.33	100.00
TX	Monetary	152	152	100.00	96.05	100.00
TX	Separation	152	152	100.00	95.39	100.00
TX	Nonseparation	152	152	100.00	94.74	100.00
UT	Monetary	150	150	100.00	98.00	99.33
UT	Separation	153	153	100.00	98.69	99.35
UT	Nonseparation	151	151	100.00	100.00	100.00
VA	Monetary	159	159	100.00	100.00	100.00
VA	Separation	159	159	100.00	98.74	100.00
VA	Nonseparation	159	159	100.00	98.74	100.00
VT	Monetary	150	150	100.00	97.33	100.00
VT	Separation	150	150	100.00	92.67	100.00
VT	Nonseparation	150	150	100.00	98.00	100.00
WA	Monetary	144	144	100.00	88.89	97.22
WA	Separation	145	145	100.00	87.59	97.93
WA	Nonseparation	147	147	100.00	91.84	98.64
WI	Monetary	152	152	100.00	75.66	96.71
WI	Separation	152	152	100.00	79.61	98.68
WI	Nonseparation	151	151	100.00	87.42	97.35
WV	Monetary	153	153	100.00	82.35	92.16
WV	Separation	154	154	100.00	82.47	90.26
WV	Nonseparation	154	154	100.00	80.52	90.26
WY	Monetary	150	150	100.00	94.00	100.00
WY	Separation	150	150	100.00	94.67	99.33
WY	Nonseparation	150	150	100.00	100.00	100.00

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.