

PY21 Grantee Performance Evaluation Transcript

March 27, 2023

0:0:0.0 --> 0:0:23.960

Ron Schack

OK, so hi everyone. This is an overview of the PY 21 grantee performance evaluation for SCSEP. I'm Ron Schack. I'm managing director of the Charter Oak Group and I've been doing these performance evaluations for almost 20 years now, so they're always a little different, but wanted to give everyone an overview of how we went about it this year, particularly how we adjusted the performance targets for those measures that had targets, especially the employment measures. So let's get started.

What we wanted to cover today was a quick review of the measures themselves, a distinction between what we mean by targets and what we mean by goals. Talk a little bit about the statistical adjustment model and where we are with that and then what we actually did to adjust the employment measure targets and what influenced that had on the overall results of the PY 21 performance evaluation where we're going with goal setting the Sam and beyond and give you a chance to ask any questions and hopefully I can answer them or I can get you the answer and we'll get back to you as soon as we can.

0:1:43.50 --> 0:2:13.260

McNeace, Meche - ETA CTR

Ron this is Michi, before you start your presentation, can we just make a quick announcement about the Q&A section when you will get to it that when we do get to the Q&A like our all-grantee calls, everyone is muted. So if they have any questions they would have to raise their use the icon to raise their hand and then we will unmute them and then they can ask their questions from there or they can always put it in the chat and then we'll monitor there to chat for you, Ron.

0:2:16.250 --> 0:2:17.830

Ron Schack

That's perfect. Thanks a lot.

0:2:18.50 --> 0:2:18.880

McNeace, Meche - ETA CTR

You're welcome.

0:2:20.160 --> 0:2:27.500

Ron Schack

So just very briefly to remind people, when we talk about the SCSEP performance measures you know what, what we're talking about, we have we have seven in this program. We have three of which we call employment related measures, right. The first one is the employment rate, the second quarter after the quarter of that set. So that's the percentage of participants who are in unsubsidized employment during the second quarter after the quarter from the program.

And the second measure is the employment rate in the fourth quarter after the quarter of that. So the percentage of participants who are in an unsubsidized employment during the fourth quarter after exit from the program. And then then there's the median earnings rate, which is the median earnings of

participants who are in unsubsidized employment during the second quarter after exit from the program.

Then we have three other measures which we call SCSEP specific measures. The first one is the service level, the number of participants who are active on the last day of the reporting period, or who exited during the reporting period divided by the number of modified community service positions and by modified we mean that we have authorized positions and we modify that number of authorized positions for each grantee by any minimum wage provisions that are enforced in the counties in which they operate.

The second SCSEP specific measure is the Community Service measure. The number of hours of community service in the reporting period divided by the number of hours of community service funded by the grant minus the number of paid training hours and any paid sick leave hours in the reporting period. So you can see in those two measures in particular that during the pandemic, these two measures were a little precarious because of the potential for having a lot of people on paid sick and then moving some people over into paid training when they weren't able to do a regular community service.

I keep seeing messages about not being able to hear me are Michi and the other two Tech staff are you able to hear me OK.

0:5:32.60 --> 0:5:33.770

McNeace, Meche - ETA CTR

Yeah, we can hear you very clearly.

0:5:34.300 --> 0:5:35.660

Bronson, Bradley K - ETA CTR

Yes, sounds great.

0:5:35.260 --> 0:5:42.10

McNeace, Meche - ETA CTR

So anyone who's having a hard time sometimes if you log off and log back in, it might correct the problem. Bradley, do you have any other suggestions?

0:5:45.740 --> 0:5:49.790

Bronson, Bradley K - ETA CTR

That sounds good. Or if you have earpiece or headphone trying to plug it in.

0:5:53.500 --> 0:5:56.240

Ron Schack

Thank you. I just wanted to make sure it wasn't me.

0:5:59.620 --> 0:6:11.500

Ron Schack

So that then the third SCSEP specific measure is the service to most in need and this is where we look at the average number of barriers per participant and that's the total number with the following characteristics. Severe disability, frail age 75 or older, Old enough but not receiving Social Security, title two severely, limited employment prospects. All of these different barriers that are listed here divided

by the number of participants who are active on the last day of the reporting period or who exited during the report period, so we add up all those barriers for any participant who has active anytime during the report period and then we divide by the number of participants. And so that number is typically something like 2.7 or 2.9 or 3.2. That's the kind of number we got from that operationalization of that measure.

And then finally, we have effectiveness in serving employers, participants and host agencies and those are the customer surveys where we've kind of put the customer survey firm employers on hold for a little bit while we redevelop it, but we are doing the customer survey for participants and for host agencies.

So just a little bit on targets versus goals. The new employment measures were implemented in 2018 and because the new way of operationalizing these measures meant that we didn't have a good baseline for goal setting, we started out with targets for these measures. And when targets are set for a measure, they communicate performance expectations, but the measure is not used in calculating the aggregate percent of goals achieved and does not require a corrective action plan if you don't achieve 80% of your target.

So we started off with targets for the employment measures back in PY 2018 and then the pandemic hit and we had a national competition with a transition. So during that time we continue to use targets rather than goals for employment measures. And also during the pandemic we said as I mentioned earlier and community service were not panning in the way we expected them to behave because of the pandemic. And in PY 20 and 21 we used targets for those measures rather than goals. However, now we're in PY 22, now all measures have goals rather than targets, and when they have goals, they are included in the aggregate percent of goal achieved and if you don't make 80% on a particular measure, you're required to do a corrective action plan.

So and then later, I'll talk about the implications of missing 80% of your targets or goals on other things moving forward. Alright, so you've heard me mention the statistical adjustment model, in SCSEP, where required to apply a model similar to the workforce investment and Opportunity Act statistical adjustment model. The WIOA model uses regression analysis to predict values for each of the three common employment measures. So, this is going to sound technical, but I'm going to try to explain it clearly as we go along, where the dependent variable of these models is one of the three employment measures and the independent variables are various customer characteristics and economic variables and the level of analysis is the grantee. So been refining our version, the SCSEP version of the model, since 2018. However, we still don't have enough data to apply the Sam models directly. We use the results of the Sam to inform a more limited application of adjustments. And I mean no, explain how we do that.

But just so you know, we have been working on the Sam model, we actually for the past several years we've used the quarterly data for the measures and we have run these models for the three employment measures and we run a separate set of models for each of the three measures and we run basically a base model which includes just the customer characteristics model characteristic measures. Then we do another model where we include those variables and economic variables and then we also run more elaborate models with dummy variables to control for different regional characteristics and also deal with small cell sizes. So ultimately, we look and see which of those models for each of the three measures yield the best results and we do that in two ways. We check to see the proportion of

variation that's explained by each of the measures, and that's using this R square value, right. So usually, the model that comes out the best is the model that includes the economic variables and the small denominator adjustment.

You see that the last time we ran these models for Q2 employment, 31% of the proportion of the variation was explained. So when I say that what I mean is we see across the grantees that different grantees have different Q2 employment rates, and the model explains about 1/3 of the variation. Which isn't really that good, right? Same thing for quarter four, about third of the variation. And then finally for median earnings, we do a little bit better. We explain about 2/3 of the variation, but that's still not really that great and this is another way of looking at this. This is for Q2 employment, these are the different models we run and the regression model is that predicts that line that predicts a through regression what any particular grantee would be having. And these are the actual grantee values above and below the line. So it's capturing some of the variation, it's somewhat predictive, but because we lack real good data and because there are other unmeasured things that explains some of the variation, we're still not quite there yet. And the same is true of Q4 employment and median earnings, right, that the actual regression analysis doesn't isn't really all that great at predicting any the grantees actual performance, right because of that they are somewhat informative however, and because of that and because of the need to actually apply a model that's similar to WIOA.

And we use the statistical adjustment model to inform our adjustment methodology, but we don't use it directly so what we do instead is we update economic factors directly, unemployment, poverty and weekly wages. And then we use the Sam to identify important relationships between customer characteristics and the outcome measures, and then we do a more mechanical adjustment like we have for many years.

So for example, In the economic factors, we actually look at the weighted unemployment rate for each grantee and by weighted I mean that we calculate the unemployed, the overall unemployment rate for the grantee, but based on the unemployment rates and each of the counties in which they serve and that gets weighted by the number of individuals they serve in each county, the number of authorized position and each county, so we get a weighted unemployment rate for each grantee and then we run quartiles on that.

By running quartiles, we get a threshold for the lowest 25% the next highest 25%, the next highest 25% and then ultimately the highest 25% and we have 5 adjustment percentage points available for each of these economic factors, and if a grantee is in the highest 25% of the unemployment rates, they get all five points. If they're in the next highest, they get 3.25 points. I think it is. And then they if they're in the next tie us, they get 2.5 points and then if they're in the lowest quartile they only get 1.25 of adjustment points and those are points that are taken off percentage points that are taken off their target level.

And we do the same thing for poverty rate, and we do the same thing for weekly wage rate except it's in the opposite direction. The higher the weekly wage rate, the lower the less adjustment points they get. Then then we look at the customer characteristics out of the Sam model and we've identified some for each of the measures that have an influence on the outcomes. So for Q2, we've identified 3 factors, male, displaced homemaker, and bachelors or master's degree.

If a particular grantee has a high percentage more than one standard deviation of male participants, they actually get a downward adjustment. Same thing for displaced homemakers, but if they have a higher than average, more than one standard deviation percentage of people with bachelors or master's degrees, they actually get an upward adjustment.

And this is this is shown here. I know this is kind of hard to see, but each individual grantee, their percentage for male, for gender as the percentage of males and the percentage of displaced homemakers and the percentage of those with bachelors and master's degrees are examined. If they have higher than one standard deviation on those, they get a downward adjustment for male or displaced homemaker, and they get an upward adjustment for bachelors or master's then the same thing is done for Q4 employment. We have a slightly different mix of variables, but the same approach is utilized.

Same thing with median earnings, so the adjustment of the negotiated goals was done by rerunning these Sam model with the final PY 21 data. Looking at those variables that had an impact on outcomes and then making the adjustments for those that did the way I just described and also making adjustments for those economic factors, the unemployment rate, the poverty rate and the weekly wage rate.

So what did all of that do? in the vast majority of the cases with this adjustment methodology, this resulted in either no change in the goal or target, or a downward adjustment in a very few cases, this resulted in a minor upward adjustment of the target, but in no case where these slight upward adjustments determinative the grantee and not achieving 80% of their target.

The resulting adjustment targets were then used in the evaluation of grantee performance. That is, comparing actual performance to these adjusted targets together with the unadjusted goals for service level community service most in need and customer satisfaction. In in PY 21 because of the weirdness I described in the service level and community service measures the only the most in need and customer satisfaction measures were used in calculating the percent of aggregate performance achieved.

All the other measures were treated as targets rather than goals for that purpose. So what happened? So nationwide this is where we ended up. Our target or goal was 37.1%, our actual performance was at 32.4 and we had a percent of the target achieved of 87.3.

For Q4, we had a percent of target achieved of 91.8 for median earnings, we were a little over our actual target at 104.4%. For service level, we were at 98.1% of goal achieved, for community service where we are at 103.7% most in need 107.6. Participant customer satisfaction we were at 103.5% and host agency we were at 102.8%.

When you look at the grantees, for Q2, 23 grantees achieved less than 80% of their Q2 employment target adjusted the way I discussed. 24 grantees achieved less than 80% of their Q4 target. 16 grantees achieved less than 80% of their median earnings target. 11 grantees achieve less than 80% of their service level, 14 achieve less than 80% of community service, 8 achieve less than 80% of most in need, one achieved less than 80% of their participant customers satisfaction goal and two achieve less than 80% of their host agency.

But again, because we only used most in need and customer satisfaction and the calculation of aggregate percent of goal achieved, only two grantees missed 80% of their aggregate percent of goal

achieved, which is a good thing for everybody. Just to show you the distribution of performance this is aggregate percent of goal achieved again, very few were below 80.

For Q2 employment, you can see that there was a pretty wide distribution of scores from over 200% in a few cases to a very low in a few cases. This is a presentation for both States and nationals so the same thing is true of the percent of targeted achieved for Q4, A lot of variation and similar for median earnings.

And then these were taken right out of for the other measures, the Community service level and most need these were taken right off of info space. So these aren't sorted by the highest to lowest, but you can see where the actual percent of goal achieve line is and then the actual performance here is the are the bars. This is for community service, this is for service level and then most in need.

And then customer satisfaction of both participant and host agency, we're actually going to post the actual values on all the measures for each grantee in the next few days. But I want to emphasize that almost everyone made their aggregate percent of goal achieved was over 80% for almost everyone, and the other thing to remember is that in PY 21 the employment measures are that we adjusted our targets only right, so while we went through this adjustment and it resulted in a substantial number of downward adjustments on the targets that were still a significant number that missed 80. Which they were targets, so it has no essential consequence, but it's still important to pay attention particularly where a grantee, had three or four measures where they missed their target of 80%, and that's shown in the in the actual evaluation of grantee performance that will be posting.

So I would suggest that you look at your own performance and if you have missed several measures in particular I would try to figure out why that might be and know that this year our current year we're now working with goals for all measures. There are no more targets, it's all actual goals and so in order to understand that, we need to pay attention to all the measures and how they are calculated and what goes into them so that you know where you stand and what you might need to do to improve.

That means paying attention to customer flow, enrollment levels and client status that are exited and we're not using wage records yet. Hopefully Someday within my lifetime or sooner.

So following up with these clients early and often and maintaining contact with clients as a key part of managing your performance on those employment related measures. And so I've said a lot, hopefully I didn't confuse you too much and I'm happy to answer any questions you might have.

0:30:10.290 --> 0:30:13.140

McNeace, Meche - ETA CTR

Ron, did you want to answer some questions?

0:30:13.60 --> 0:30:14.670

Ron Schack

Sure. Yes, absolutely.

0:30:15.30 --> 0:30:20.490

McNeace, Meche - ETA CTR

OK. We'll go with whoever has their hands up. So Betty.

0:30:21.500 --> 0:30:26.970

Melakebirhan, Betelhem A - ETA CTR

Yes, uh. Our first question is from Olga. I'm about to open her line now.

0:30:28.780 --> 0:30:32.570

Melakebirhan, Betelhem A - ETA CTR

Olga, your line is open. You can unmute yourself and ask your question.

0:30:33.250 --> 0:30:45.750

Yulikova, Olga (ELD)

Thank you. So, uh, I guess I just have a practical question. I try to get our reports on GPMS system, and nothing is coming up. So what does that mean?

0:30:50.870 --> 0:30:54.650

Ron Schack

I I'm going to ask Michi to respond to that question.

0:30:55.570 --> 0:31:11.10

McNeace, Meche - ETA CTR

I think we even have Denise and Tina on the call too this time. But I'm like we said during our virtual live office hours that the QPR's are being worked on and they will be rolled out. So it's, everybody's having the same issue unless there's an update. And I'm not sure if Denise or Tina still on. If they are, is there any updates.

0:31:28.510 --> 0:31:39.330

Denise Thompson

Yeah, I saw the QPR has been rolled out Michi it's in GPMS. If that's the primary report for this data, then it's out there.

0:31:39.890 --> 0:31:43.220

McNeace, Meche - ETA CTR

Alright, so Olga, did you try like today?

0:31:43.840 --> 0:31:47.640

Yulikova, Olga (ELD)

Yeah, I just did, actually.

0:31:46.110 --> 0:31:47.670

McNeace, Meche - ETA CTR

And it's which one?

0:31:55.190 --> 0:31:56.100

Yulikova, Olga (ELD)

PY 21.

0:31:56.840 --> 0:32:8.710

McNeace, Meche - ETA CTR

In your admin console, there's like 3-4 different areas for QPR. Are you looking at frozen QPR, are you look which button are you pushing to get your QPR?

0:32:8.230 --> 0:32:11.760

Yulikova, Olga (ELD)

Let me see generate internal QPR reports.

0:32:11.910 --> 0:32:14.620

McNeace, Meche - ETA CTR

Alright, so Denise, that's the one that is working right?

0:32:14.630 --> 0:32:17.740

Denise Thompson

Yeah. And actually that's the only one out there at this point in time.

0:32:18.180 --> 0:32:22.300

Yulikova, Olga (ELD)

So I went there, I selected the year 21, I selected the last quarter and branch is Massachusetts. I'm going try again export. So OK, let's see what happens, I tried a few minutes ago, there was nothing.

0:32:55.0 --> 0:32:55.530

McNeace, Meche - ETA CTR

Alright.

0:32:56.130 --> 0:32:57.560

Yulikova, Olga (ELD)

OK, thanks. I mean.

0:32:56.880 --> 0:32:59.820

McNeace, Meche - ETA CTR

Give it a try and I think we have another, OK we have another hand up. I think it was Adam. Betty.

0:33:5.570 --> 0:33:8.610

Melakebirhan, Betelhem A - ETA CTR

Aaron. Aaron, you are unmuted, unmute yourself from your computer and ask your question.

0:33:23.160 --> 0:33:24.840

Aaron Levitt

Oh, there we go. Hi. Can you hear me?

0:33:24.790 --> 0:33:25.420

Ron Schack

Hi, Aaron.

0:33:25.800 --> 0:33:43.730

Aaron Levitt

Hi. Hey, Ron, thanks for this. I had like three questions on the methodology. Just so I make sure I understand, you mentioned that you're doing the adjustments at the grantee level. So our goals are at the grant level, right? Is that are they just wants the grant level or literally the grantee across all grants?

0:33:45.750 --> 0:33:52.260

Ron Schack

So it's at the grantee level, so each grantee has a goal that's associated that they have. They have goals that were negotiated, original goals and targets that were negotiated when the grant was awarded right?

0:34:10.590 --> 0:34:15.460

Aaron Levitt

So if we have like grants in three different states, they're each being calculated separately, right? It's not like a mishmash.

0:34:19.300 --> 0:34:22.220

Ron Schack

So if you're a national grantee, you might have different states in which they operate, but you have one set of goals and targets for you as a national grantee.

0:34:44.940 --> 0:35:0.420

Aaron Levitt

Oh, my mistake. I'm sorry. Thanks. And then I was just curious, you mentioned that with at least some of the variables you're splitting them into core tiles. And I was just curious why doing that instead of using the actual values and getting the extra power?

0:35:0.950 --> 0:35:3.920

Ron Schack

So, so we are splitting them so we're doing different things with different variables, so we are using the economic variables in a regression in the statistical adjustment model. And so that's all the values are being used in that but that's in the Sam model, that's not very predictive. So we when we went to this more less sophisticated adjustment methodology. We needed some way of distributing the points that was understandable and standard. So we went with quartiles in the case of the economic variables, and we went with standard deviation in the case of the customer characteristics.

0:36:1.580 --> 0:36:4.890

Aaron Levitt

Gotcha. Thanks. And then just one other question was this is just were up quickly so I might not have understood what I'm seeing, but on the graphs, you showed, like the distributions, it looked like all the like all the low X outliers were above the regression line and all the high X outliers were below the regression line, which would be a weird distribution. Are these like cubic or something?

0:36:26.190 --> 0:36:26.940

Ron Schack

Let's see. If you're talking about these.

0:36:30.360 --> 0:36:33.850

Aaron Levitt

Yeah. No, wait. It was. Yeah, those right.

0:36:33.460 --> 0:36:37.0

Ron Schack

OK. Yeah. So these are just so. I think the color coding is just the ones that were above the regression line were coded one way and the ones that were below the regression line were quote coded are color-

coded different way so yeah so like there are some over here that are that are below the regression line, but then there's some over here that are above the regression line so.

0:37:14.910 --> 0:37:18.880

Aaron Levitt

It isn't kind of weird that there's like none that are above the regression line. And like that would just be a peculiar distribution.

0:37:23.300 --> 0:37:26.520

Ron Schack

Yeah, I don't necessarily think that there's anything to that, but yeah, I agree that is a little strange.

0:37:35.260 --> 0:37:37.50

Aaron Levitt

OK, never mind. I was just like, huh?

0:37:35.590 --> 0:37:43.820

Ron Schack

Yeah there are some differences, but the extremes are 10 to be. You know what it is? This is where they would be predicted, right? But if the outliers tend to be at the higher end, right? The stream outliers tend to be at the higher end, which makes some sense from a prediction perspective.

0:38:7.90 --> 0:38:10.560

Aaron Levitt

Yeah, I don't know. They would generally be It's just usually you see, like you know there's a few up the other way or something. OK, that was it. Thanks so much.

0:38:13.400 --> 0:38:14.570

Ron Schack

Yeah. You're welcome.

0:38:17.480 --> 0:38:24.710

McNeace, Meche - ETA CTR

OK, so Ron that someone asked would you be able to share your PowerPoint that we could e-mail it to them?

0:38:25.70 --> 0:38:26.250

Ron Schack

Yes, absolutely.

0:38:26.580 --> 0:38:27.500

McNeace, Meche - ETA CTR

OK, great.

0:38:28.360 --> 0:38:37.950

McNeace, Meche - ETA CTR

And we have another question here in the chat. How are we to view these goals? Will they be OK? We talked about the QPR would swear your goals are.

0:38:41.160 --> 0:38:42.270

Ron Schack

Right, so.

0:38:38.620 --> 0:38:43.310

McNeace, Meche - ETA CTR

So currently the one QPR is available.

0:38:43.480 --> 0:39:0.900

Ron Schack

Right. And the QPR for PY 22 has different goals than what we're utilized in PY 21, right? They were negotiated in a new round of negotiation for PY 22 and PY 23. And they're actually substantially lower than the goals for PY 21, right, because the baseline utilized when we negotiated PY 22 goals was already affected by the pandemic and was substantially lower already. So your goals for PY 22 are going to be lower than the goals generally speaking, than the goals for PY 21 were. Even after adjustment.

0:39:36.890 --> 0:39:51.900

McNeace, Meche - ETA CTR

Alright, thank you. I think you may have answered this question with Aaron, but this this one question says if Nationals operates under the state grantee, then are the goals targets that of the state?

0:39:53.490 --> 0:39:57.650

Ron Schack

Yeah. So if nationals are acting as a sub Or a state that their goals for being that sub grantee would be the state grantee goals. But if they are national operating in multiple states, not as a sub guarantee but under their own auspices, then their goals are the national grantee goals.

0:40:22.390 --> 0:40:42.140

McNeace, Meche - ETA CTR

Correct. Alright, so I'm going to put two of you on blast here. Crystal and Lance. Both of you agree to be confused there said we're very confused. So you want to be unmuted so you can so we can help unconfuse you? Crystal, you're denying it. You're like. No, no, no, no, no, no, no. You're not confused. You're good? Alright. Lance, are you good?

0:40:50.570 --> 0:41:8.720

Ron Schack

And if anything occurs to anybody and wants to shoot me an e-mail, I'd be happy to elaborate on any of the stuff. I know I kind of went quick but I didn't want to bother people down with too much technical detail either.

0:41:9.720 --> 0:41:10.350

McNeace, Meche - ETA CTR

OK.

0:41:11.600 --> 0:41:13.840

McNeace, Meche - ETA CTR

And Betty, can you unmute Lance.

0:41:14.520 --> 0:41:17.710

Melakebirhan, Betelhem A - ETA CTR

Uh, we have one question from the Donti.

0:41:18.310 --> 0:41:18.840

McNeace, Meche - ETA CTR

OK.

0:41:20.690 --> 0:41:25.970

Melakebirhan, Betelhem A - ETA CTR

He is the first one. That's why, Donti your line is unmuted. Go ahead and ask your question.

0:41:26.270 --> 0:41:52.510

McField, Donti (DOES)

Thank you. Good afternoon. I'm just echoing the sentiments because I'm you know I'm a long time SCSEP individual as well and I've never gone this far without seeing QPR and I am having issues as well where the other day I was only able to pull the national QPR to see what SCSEP was doing nationally, but I was not able to pull our internal QPR. I'm wondering, is the National office sending notifications if individuals are not meeting performance goals currently, or you know, do they have access to internal QPR's that we may be able to request from our FPO or the National Office? If this glitch isn't rectified soon because we're about to be in fourth quarter? Thank you.

0:42:20.30 --> 0:42:44.900

McNeace, Meche - ETA CTR

Ron, let me jump in here. So I'm just so that we can kind of stay on track on what Ron's performance are. We see that through the chat that there's several grantees that are saying they they're having problems with their QPR and since this is not a GPMS technical assistance meeting we're going to kind of sideline that and we'll share them with the Zendesk or with SCSEP help and let them know that and they're seeing it as well. So just know that if you're having problems with your QPR, Denise and Tina what do you want them to do?

0:42:59.450 --> 0:43:31.300

Denise Thompson

I also I also want to make a quick suggestion, Michi. Because to our knowledge QPR that out there and it's available for everyone, so maybe they can join these sessions that you have those live sessions that you have and kind of walk through how they're trying to run these QPRS. So we can identify to make sure first of all that it's being run correctly and if there's an issue we could definitely see it that way. But as far as we know, the QPR is available in GPMS and everyone should be able to run it.

0:43:32.190 --> 0:43:38.920

McField, Donti (DOES)

Can we be provided because I have attended those, those assist those technical.

0:43:38.570 --> 0:43:39.980

McNeace, Meche - ETA CTR

Virtual lives, yeah.

0:43:40.40 --> 0:43:55.180

McField, Donti (DOES)

Yes, ma'am. So can, can we get some instructions? Possibly, you know, just five bullets going to this pull, this pull that so that we all can be on the same page since it's something that everyone is experiencing having an issue with.

0:43:55.970 --> 0:43:58.260

McNeace, Meche - ETA CTR

You know what? Let me do this, you know.

0:43:56.30 --> 0:44:10.820

Denise Thompson

So I have you checked the last response? Cause yeah, I know this is not a GPMS session but just wanted to encourage everyone to take a look at the user guide that was distributed a couple weeks ago. I believed their steps in there to tell you how to run the CPR.

0:44:14.30 --> 0:44:15.780

McNeace, Meche - ETA CTR

Yes, absolutely.

0:44:16.830 --> 0:44:24.210

McNeace, Meche - ETA CTR

So the user guide is available on SCSEP help. It is also available on workforce GPS community of practice, and if you still need a, want us to go through them with you, just shoot me an e-mail. The problem is we are going to be out of town. But we can try and make some accommodations this week. OK, Donti and anybody else who's having QPR issues. Send an e-mail to SCSEPTechnicalassistance@dol.gov. Anybody having QPR issues go ahead and do that and then we're going to kind of stay focused on what the purpose of why we have Doctor Shack here right on performance.

0:44:56.520 --> 0:45:0.70

Ron Schack

Yeah, and I and I will say I do understand the need for accessing your QPR's. You need to understand where you're at and you need to begin as I've emphasized, looking at how your customers are moving, what's going on with your core measures. So you know this is an important thing and we need to work together to resolve these issues.

0:45:31.880 --> 0:45:35.350

McNeace, Meche - ETA CTR

Yeah, but I'm going to go in there and check myself too.

0:45:36.870 --> 0:45:40.340

McNeace, Meche - ETA CTR

So any other questions for Ron about his presentation?

0:45:47.330 --> 0:45:50.620

McNeace, Meche - ETA CTR

I think Lance, Betty Lance asked you to unmute him.

0:45:50.630 --> 0:45:53.90

Melakebirhan, Betelhem A - ETA CTR

Yeah, he's a muted, your line is open.

0:45:53.360 --> 0:46:2.370

Lance Butler

Thank you. I appreciate it, Betty. Ron, this very informative presentation and essentially, you've already put some of my questions to bed. And I don't mean to go off topic or be disrespectful, but in my opinion the QPR is very, very relevant in this forum as well because like other people are indicating, Ron just stole my Thunder that in order for us to run our SCSEP program efficiently and effectively, we have to be able to model that, monitor the goals that Ron just went over and I mean I haven't been able to view my QPR. I don't know if ever anyone else is having issues, but if I can't view my QPR and yes, although this is not a GPMS forum, if I can't view my QPR, then essentially this presentation is irrelevant until it gets fixed. I can't track that stuff myself.

0:46:53.610 --> 0:46:54.500

McNeace, Meche - ETA CTR

That is true.

0:46:53.490 --> 0:47:0.950

Lance Butler

You know, I mean and again, no disrespect politely. I'm just articulating my frustrations as a SCSEP grantee, you know runner essentially like I want to give my I want to track my sub grantees. I want to provide the best service as possible. I want to be effective and efficient in serving the older population. And if you know that's not available, I think y'all can see how we're not able to do that like you all are wanting us to.

0:47:29.660 --> 0:47:33.440

McNeace, Meche - ETA CTR

No, we understand last we completely understand wholeheartedly.

0:47:33.680 --> 0:47:34.700

Lance Butler

Yes, ma'am. Thank you.

0:47:34.720 --> 0:47:35.430

McNeace, Meche - ETA CTR

We do.

0:47:36.940 --> 0:47:39.670

Lance Butler

Appreciate it. Ron it was a great presentation. Thank you, Sir.

0:47:40.500 --> 0:47:43.890

Ron Schack

Thank you. And you know just remember in the for what it's worth department, that this is for PY 21. This is on stuff that's already happened to the extent that that's still relevant there it is, but yeah, yes, we need to move forward.

0:48:3.860 --> 0:48:4.380

Lance Butler

Yes, Sir.

0:48:5.690 --> 0:48:7.850

McNeace, Meche - ETA CTR

And Betty, we have another hand up Crystal.

0:48:9.810 --> 0:48:11.740

Melakebirhan, Betelhem A - ETA CTR

She put her hand down. You still want to ask Crystal?

0:48:19.10 --> 0:48:21.50

Melakebirhan, Betelhem A - ETA CTR

Go ahead and unmute yourself now, Crystal.

0:48:25.790 --> 0:48:55.620

Crystal Odom-McKinney

Yeah. So I'm I just wanted to again just kind of bring it home a little bit. I understand this is old information. However, I think I put this in the chat, we all understand that we're navigating this, some of us smoother or some of us more bumpier. However, Ron is here to do this presentation and let's you know, can we just move through the presentation and get on the GPMS and the office hours that the team is now providing us, thank you very much and work with that. I mean I think we can all jump in the chat with 99 reasons why we're not getting what we need so that's all I'm saying. I'm like, you know and I think a little bit my OCD is kicking in. I'm one of the diverse learners. So I will look at this 22 times and read it and then you know come back if I have any questions. Ron, thank you.

0:49:20.620 --> 0:49:23.60

Ron Schack

Absolutely. Thank you very much.

0:49:28.410 --> 0:49:40.110

Ron Schack

All right. Well, I will provide this for you guys so you can look at each detail and ask me any question you like as they occur to you. I guess closeout the presentation and hopefully it at least gave you a sense of what we did to adjust the final goals for PY 21 and where we're moving forward. Thanks everybody.

0:50:6.290 --> 0:50:23.150

Byron Kline (Guest)

And thank you, Ron. This is Byron from the SCSEP National Office and I just wanted to just to say to everyone, not only are we grateful, Ron for you and this presentation, even though this was not a GPMS event I want to thank the field for your questions, you know and your concerns. I want you to know, on behalf of the National office team, that we hear you while this is not the forum to address some of those issues with QPR. Please don't think that they go unheard and please don't think that we're not working on these. We understand your frustration we are working with our great contractors to try and clear many of these things up, but you know, as difficult as this is, we understand that you guys work hard all the time, so, feel free to continue to drop off the line. We will take back these comments to our

leadership and just thank you for being engaged and we appreciate your hard work. We also appreciate your patience. So thank you again to Ron. I want to thank our contracting friends at BCT for Denise Thompson and I believe Tina was on the line. Want to thank you, Michi McNeace and the team at Two Tech, Bradley and Betty and Kevin, thank you all very much and we look forward to getting not only your questions answered about this presentation, but all of the questions that you have and concerns about GPMS in general. Thank you very much.

0:51:57.430 --> 0:52:24.410

Denise Thompson

So I just wanted to do a quick piggyback off of Byron's comment. Thank you, Byron, for opening that door. And just want to remind everyone who's on the call if you are having these types of issues, if you can contact us through Zendesk, we will work through the issues as far as we know the QPR is running. So if you are having issues not being able to run that report, it's something that you should reach out about just as an FYI. So thank you.

0:52:26.40 --> 0:52:32.640

McNeace, Meche - ETA CTR

So Denise and Ron and Byron, can you guys stay on after everybody logs off for just a couple of seconds?

0:52:33.240 --> 0:52:33.680

Denise Thompson

Yes.

0:52:34.20 --> 0:52:35.110

McNeace, Meche - ETA CTR

All right, great. So we're at that point, Ron.

0:52:42.420 --> 0:52:58.630

Ron Schack

Yes. We're all set. Thanks everybody for sticking with it even though you know it is a little technical and I know a little frustrating given the state of things, but I wanted to share how we went about doing what we did here.

0:52:59.820 --> 0:53:3.190

McNeace, Meche - ETA CTR

And we will e-mail the PowerPoint out to everyone. With that being said, have an awesome rest of your day and we will see you all soon and we'll see most of you on our next GPMS training, which is this week on Friday, 2:00 to 3:30 PM. EST See you then.