

APPENDIX B

QC WORKSHEETS

- QC-1 Organization
- QC-2 Authority
- QC-3 Written Procedures
- QC-4 Forms
- QC-5 Sample Selection, Assignment, and Exceptions Review
- QC-6 Case Timeliness
- QC-7 Regional Office Exception Report
- QC-8 Case Activity Report
- QC-9 Annual QC Administrative Determination
Regional Monitor Discussion Form

* Forms revised 1/93.

WORKSHEET QC-1

ORGANIZATION

State _____ Date _____ Reviewer _____

I. Questions

1. Does the QC supervisor (QCS) report to one of the following? Yes
No

a. A person who has no line responsibility for any function audited by QC.

b. The head or deputy head of the SESA.

c. The head or deputy head of UI, or equivalent, who has staff or line management responsibility for other functions and activities in addition to benefits.

Name, title of QCS' superior: _____

2. Are the QC supervisor and investigators covered by the State Merit System? Yes
No

3. Does the QC unit have access (by policies and procedures) to the records and data bases necessary to carry out its functions? Yes
No

II. Conclusion

SESA adheres to QC requirements.

SESA does not adhere to QC requirements - agrees to correct.

SESA does not adhere to QC requirements - does not agree to correct.

III. Explanation

WORKSHEET QC-2

AUTHORITY

State _____ Date _____ Reviewer _____

I. Actions. Enter the number from the "Options" section below which explains how the following are issued:

_____ Monetary redeterminations

_____ Findings of fraud

_____ Nonmonetary determinations/redeterminations

_____ Other actions not included above (OP's, UP's, voided offsets, etc.) Identify:

II. Options

1. The SESA's written policies and procedures give the QC unit the authority to issue determinations/redeterminations when errors are found in a case.

2. The QC unit refers findings to other units to issue determinations/redeterminations, and in the event of disputes with those units, the QC unit has access to a higher authority to obtain resolution.

3. Other (explain)

III. Conclusion

SESA adheres to Quality Control requirements.

SESA does not adhere to QC requirements - agrees to correct.

SESA does not adhere to QC requirements - does not agree to correct.

IV. Explanation:

WORKSHEET QC-3

WRITTEN PROCEDURES

State _____ Date _____ Reviewer _____

I. Questions

1. Does the SESA QC Operations Handbook cover all investigative and administrative functions of the QC unit? Consider the following: Yes
No

- Responsibilities of QC staff
- Support - data processing
- Maintaining data files
- Sampling
- Assignment of cases
- Investigations
- Interstate procedures for assisting other States and requesting assistance from other States
- Coding/error classification
- Records - data input, documentation, retention
- Relationships with other SESA units - BPC, Benefits, Tax, Appeals, LOs, JS
- Process for making determinations resulting from QC investigations

2. Have the procedures been adapted to particular circumstances of the State? Consider the following: Yes
No

- Work search requirements
- ES registration requirements
- Procedures for obtaining necessary dependency information, if applicable
- Procedures for contacts with non-English speaking claimants

3. Ascertain whether or not the requirements of ET Handbook No. 395, including Appendix C - Investigation Guide, have been properly incorporated into SESA procedures:

a. Are the procedures consistent with ET Handbook No. 395? Consider:	Yes
- Data collection	No
- Investigations	
- Documentation	
- Retention of records	
- Reporting	

WORKSHEET QC-3

(page 2 of 2)

State _____

Date _____

b. Are the investigative procedures designed to accord with standard SESA fact-finding practices?	Yes
	No
c. Do the investigative procedures facilitate the case completion timeliness objectives?	Yes
	No
d. Do the SESA procedures outline specifically that hearings be attended by the investigator responsible for the determination being appealed?	Yes
	No
e. Do instructions for completing the required formats specify that the investigator must explain if the information was not obtained by an in-person interview, and if not, what attempts to do so were made? (This may be satisfied by space on the formats specifically designated for this information.)	Yes
	No

II. Conclusion

SESA adheres to QC requirements.

SESA does not adhere to QC requirements - agrees to correct.

SESA does not adhere to QC requirements - does not agree to correct.

III. Explanation

WORKSHEET QC-4

FORMS

State _____ Date _____ Reviewer _____

I. Questions

Claimant Questionnaire

1. Has the questionnaire been altered as required to cover specific provisions of State law? Consider the following: Yes
No
N/A

- Base period separations
- Base period wages
- Lag period separations
- Work search requirements
- ES registration
- Income during key week
- Dependency allowances

2. Are all changes to the questionnaire adequate to obtain the necessary information? Yes
No
N/A

3. Were changes to the questionnaire limited to those necessitated by specific provisions of State law? Yes
No
N/A

Standard Formats

4. Work Search Verification - Employer

a. Are questions on the form adequate to Yes

determine whether claimant's work search contacts were acceptable according to the SESA written law and policy? No

b. Is space provided for signature of the investigator, signature of the person interviewed, and the date? Yes
No

5. Work Search Verification - Labor Organization

a. Are questions on the form adequate to determine claimant's union status? Yes
No

WORKSHEET QC-4

(page 2 of 3)

State _____

Date _____

b. Are questions on the form adequate to determine, according to SESA written law and policy, if any issues resulted from referrals to employers, referral refusals, or job refusals? Yes
No

c. Is space provided for signature of the investigator, signature of the person interviewed, and the date? Yes
No

6. Employment/Wages/Earnings Verification

a. Are questions on the form adequate to obtain, according to SESA written law and policy, reason for separation from employment, base period earnings, and earnings received during the benefit year? Yes
No

b. Is space provided for signature of the investigator, signature of the person interviewed, and the date? Yes
No

7. Disqualifying/Deductible Income Verification

a. Are questions on the form used/developed for QC adequate to determine eligibility or reductions to benefits, according to SESA written law and policy, regarding receipt of or application for pension/income/other remuneration? Yes
No

b. Is space provided for signature of investigator and date? Yes
No

8. Authorization to Release Information. If Yes

required by the State, is the form used/developed for QC adequate according to SESA requirements? No
N/A

9. Factfinding Statement. Does the form used/developed for QC provide space for the signature of the person providing the information and the date? Yes
No

WORKSHEET QC-4

(page 3 of 3)

State _____

Date _____

10. Dependency Eligibility Verification

a. Are questions on the form adequate to obtain, according to SESA written law and policy, information necessary to determine eligibility? Yes
No

b. Is space provided for signature of the investigator and the date? Yes
No

11. Summary of Investigation Narrative

a. Is adequate space provided on the form to enter pertinent facts of the case? Yes
No

b. If a "fill-in-the-blank" summary is used, is it adequate to summarize pertinent facts of cases? Yes
No

c. Is space provided for signature of the investigator and date? Yes
No

II. Conclusion

SESA adheres to QC requirements.
SESA does not adhere to QC requirements - agrees to correct.

SESA does not adhere to QC requirements - does not agree to correct.

III. Explanation

WORKSHEET QC-5

SAMPLE SELECTION, ASSIGNMENT, AND EXCEPTIONS REVIEW

State _____ Review Date _____

Type of Review: Progress (Quarterly) Final

Reviewer _____ Batch numbers:

I. QUESTIONS.

A. Sample Selection and Assignment (Non-downloading States)

- | | | |
|---|-----|----|
| 1. In each sample, was the <u>number of cases</u> assigned the same as the number pulled? | Yes | No |
| 2. In all samples reviewed, were the cases assigned <u>the same</u> as those pulled? | Yes | No |

(Downloading States)

- | | | |
|--|-----|----|
| 3. In each batch checked, were the <u>same</u> cases downloaded that were pulled by ADP program? | Yes | NO |
|--|-----|----|

B. Adequacy of Sample Levels (all States)

- | | | |
|--|-----|----|
| 1. Did this State, in one or more weeks, fall below the minimum weekly sample? | Yes | No |
| 2. Given the cumulative number of cases sampled to date, is this State likely to meet its annual sample allocation in the calendar year? | Yes | No |

C. Sampling Exceptions (all States)

- | | | |
|--|-----|----|
| 1. Has the State experienced exceptions which affect <u>representativeness</u> in its weekly samples? | Yes | No |
| 2. Has the SESA experienced any samples which included one or more <u>extraneous cases</u> ? | Yes | No |
| 3. Has one or more weekly batches picked the same key week ending date for all cases, or provided other data suggesting <u>exclusion of appropriate types of claims</u> from weekly sampling frame(s), for example: CWCs, UCFEs, UCXs? | Yes | No |

II. EXPLANATION (Describe problems or sampling exceptions SESA has experienced in sample selection or assignment, if any; detail efforts (TA or corrective action) undertaken to remedy these situations.)

WORKSHEET QC-6

CASE TIMELINESS

State _____ Date _____ Reviewer _____

Review for calendar year _____

Type of review: Progress - for quarter(s) _____
 Final

 I. Questions

1. What % of cases was completed within 60 days? _____
2. What % of cases was completed within 90 days? _____

 II. Conclusion

- SESA meets timeliness requirements.
- SESA does not meet timeliness requirements - agrees to correct.
- SESA does not meet timeliness requirements - does not need to correct.

SESA does not meet timeliness requirements - does not agree to correct.

III. Explanation

WORKSHEET QC - 7
INVESTIGATIVE EXCEPTION REPORT

STATE _____ DATE _____ MONITOR _____

TYPE OF REPORT: Progress Report - QTR. Ending _____

E=Exceptions

Final Report - CY _____

C=Cases with

Exceptions

I QUARTERLY COMPARISON

Cases Reviewed for QTR. _____
Except's

Cases Qtr. No Except's _____

Cases Qtr. W/ Except's _____

Cases Qtr. Multi. _____

	<u>1st Quarter</u>			<u>2nd Quarter</u>			<u>3rd Quarter</u>		
<u>4th Quarter</u>	#E	#C	%C	#E	#C	%C	#E	#C	%C
<u>Exception Category</u>									
<u>#E #C %C</u>									

The QC Unit DID NOT:

INVESTIGATIVE EXCEPTIONS

Identify an issue _____

Pursue issues to a supportable conclusion _____

Properly resolve issue ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___
 ___ ___ ___

PROCEDURAL EXCEPTIONS

Apply QC procedures
 correctly ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___
 ___ ___ ___

CODING EXCEPTIONS

Code case accurately ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___
 ___ ___ ___

II YEAR TO DATE

# Cases	# Cases YTD	# Cases YTD	#
Cases YTD			
Reviewed ___	No Exceptions ___	With Exceptions ___	Multi. ___
Except's			

Exception Category	#E	#C	%C Affected	#E Disagreed
--------------------	----	----	-------------	--------------

The QC unit DID NOT:

INVESTIGATIVE EXCEPTIONS

Identify an issue ___ ___ ___ ___

Pursue issues to a
 supportable conclusion ___ ___ ___ ___

Properly resolve issue ___ ___ ___ ___

PROCEDURAL EXCEPTIONS

Apply QC procedures
 correctly ___ ___ ___ ___

CODING EXCEPTIONS

Code case accurately ___ ___ ___ ___

III EXPLANATION and
COMMENTS

QC-8

Report Date: 08/27/1992

Case Activity Report

Case Availability As Of 08/27/1992

State	New Cases Avail	YTD RO Closed Cases	Previously Sampled Cases		
			(1)Pend	Not Rev'd	(2)Reopen
AZ	0	31	3	4	0
CA	0	0	0	0	0
HI	0	0	0	0	0
NV	0	0	0	0	0

Total	0	31	3	4	0

(1) Cases reviewed and have exceptions outstanding.

(2) Regional reviewed cases closed by RO & reopened by the State after RO closure. (Any case with a reopen date greater than or equal to the RO closure date, for any reopen code.)

Cases Sampled For Calendar Year 1992

State Name	1st Qtr	2nd Qtr	3rd Qtr	4th Qtr	YTD Total
AZ	38	0	0	0	38
CA	0	0	0	0	0
HI	0	0	0	0	0
NV	0	0	0	0	0

QC-9 - ANNUAL QC ADMINISTRATIVE DETERMINATION

State _____ Date of Completion _____

Name of Regional Staff Person
Completing Determination _____

Requirement

Regional Office Determination

SESA Adheres

SESA Does Not Adhere

Organization

Authority

Written Procedures

Forms

SESA Sample Selection

Timeliness of Case
Completion

Investigative Procedures

NA

NA

If any requirement(s) is(are) not met, explain SESA status.
Additional narrative and documentation should be attached to
support the conclusion, if not previously transmitted.

Summary Determination:

SESA's administration of the Quality Control program

_____ meets _____ does not meet Federal regulations.

Comments: