SCSEP Grantee Orientation Day Three Transcript

Burnett, Lauren S - ETA CTR 0:12
As your cameras are off and you are currently muted, if you agree to being recorded at this time, you may turn on your camera, at which time the agreement prompt will pop up on your screen where you can accept. So, I'll give you all a moment to do that. If you've unmuted yourself, please re-mute. This meeting is now being recorded. At the conclusion of the SCSEP grantee orientation, all recordings will be available on the CoP. Q&A will be at the end of each presentation. Should you have any questions, please don't hesitate to type them in the chat and they will be addressed in the order it is received. When adding your question to the chat, please add the grantee of whom you represent as well, to ensure that everyone can participate fully in today's SCSEP grantee orientation.
We would like to share a few captioning tips. Live captioning must be enabled individually by doing the following:
Select the three dots located between the apps and camera button.
From the drop down, select language and speech.
Under language and speech select show live captions.
When enabled you will see a disclaimer, captions will be shown in English.
One last reminder, we kindly ask that you keep your microphones muted throughout today's meeting to ensure a seamless experience for our moderators. Once again, welcome to day three of our SCSEP grantee orientation, Toni.

Wilson, Toni K - SCSEP 1:39
Thank you so much, Lauren.
I appreciate it and thank you everyone for keeping your mics muted and entering information in the chat. I did want to say thank you so much, Larry. It was a very good way to start out this session by seeing your message of thanking us, of offering this training. We're really hoping that this is helpful and that our future events will be useful for you, your staff, and your sub grantees. Because obviously our goal is just to make sure that you have all the tools that you need in reference to working with our participants. So, thank you for that.
If you could please put the next slide.
Alright, we can stay there for a minute.
So once again, for anyone that is just joining us today, my name is Toni Wilson and I am the SCSEP, Unit Chief here. And today is day three of our three-day virtual conference. Our first few days, as you know, you've got a chance to meet and hear from Steve

Rietzke and we did a lot of focus in reference to giving some foundational information about SCSEP, making sure people had the general information about their compliance, financial responsibilities, information in reference to resources and policies. But at the end of the day, we wanted to make sure that everyone had the resources to get to their answers. So, we've also created a resource hub which is in the chat and will also be given out after this presentation.
We also created various links which will all be shared on that resource hub, and then we're also putting it all together on a one-page PDF. So, for those that have subcontractors, I mean sub recipients or new staff, it'll be something that you can also easily e-mail. So, our goal is to make all this training and resources as easy as possible for everyone, so hopefully that's happening.
And today, before we get started into all things around performance, I first just wanted to take a moment to, you know, just say that we're all very heartbroken about what has happened in reference to the American Airlines, that's here in our backyard. I know there are tragedies that are happening all over the world, but it's definitely a very somber day here in the DC area and for all those that were connected. So, we just wanted to, you know, just you know, sending our thoughts and my prayers out for that. So, I just wanted to acknowledge that. Very, very sad day on that, but we will get through the day.
I also wanted to flag that day three, and we're so excited to get here. Thank you so much to the team. Oh, that's what I know I want to say. So, a few housekeeping things before we get started. One, unlike the first two days, this day is probably the day with the most detailed information. So, we do plan that we will potentially go the full-term time. I know we've ended about 1/2 hour early before that's still possible, but I just wanted people to prepare themselves that this may go to the full time and because of that we will make sure we keep the break in. So about halfway through, we'll have a 15-minute break so everyone can please, you know, walk away from the screen and do what you have to do. And we will also be addressing any questions at the very end. So, for each of the sessions we'll have a Q&A for that session and then just like the first two days, we will do final Q&A at the very end before we do our wrap up. So, if you have questions from the previous days or some thoughts, come up, please put those in the chat and we can answer those at the end. Once again, if we're not able to answer cause I, we all know that you guys are always able to stump me on something, and if we don't have the direct answer today, we will be following up with an FAQ. And so, we'll make sure that we follow up with those answers. But once and as I said yesterday, nine times out of ten, my answer will always be, start with your FPO. Your FPO is your guide. We do have some on the call, so shout out to them. They are your source in reference to helping you guide to having a successful grant experience. So, please stay in contact with your FPO

and start there for most of your questions that you may have to your specific grant. So, I just wanted to flag that and a shout out to our FPO's.
All right. I think those are the main things. I just want to make sure I got that all right.
So let's move to our next slide.
So before we jump into our agenda, I first want to start out by saying what does GPMS stand for? I'm sure people have said GPMS over the past decade for those that have been here for quite a while and those that are new, I'm sure it's the first thing that they mentioned to you in reference to starting your new job. So, if you put into the chat, we'd love to hear if you know what it actually stands for. See what people have to say there.
Alrighty, alright.
If you agree, you can. You're welcome to just put a like next to the making it easier.
Alright, so our GPMS system and give it just like two more seconds. But we are getting, I see grantee performance management system. And grantee performance management system. Alright, I think we got it. So yes, the G is usually what stumps people or maybe when I say people, I mean me. But it's not grant performance management system, it's that grantee cause, it's for you. It's your system. So, I just wanted to make sure and a reminder, we have our little alphabet soup document.
So just like GPMS, there are other things that are on there for those that are here for the first day.
Kevin can put that in the chat.
You can kind of follow along. We'll try to make sure we don't use too many acronyms, but unfortunately sometimes we can't help that.
All right.
Next slide please.
Alright, so today's agenda. We will be starting out by talking about the world of SCSEP and kind of where the state of GPMS is today. And then we'll be focusing on some SCSEP performance measures, goal setting and performance evaluation that will then lead to our 15-minute break, and then when we return, we're going to get into the reporting side. So, we'll talk about the QPR's which are, quarterly performance report and all the additional reporting that is connected to performance. We will then follow up with some updates around data validation and then end with resources and Q&A. And after this presentation, then we will end the day with any of the wrap up of Q&A and close out.
So just wanted to flag that for the day.
So with that said, let's get started.
Next slide please.
So before I bring on our speakers, I did want to just say in reference to our GPMS and our SCSEP data, I wanted to just touch base and reference through to the state of

GPMS. I will be bringing on Ali Slaughter, who will talk in a little more detail of where we're at, but I wanted to first just start out by saying thank you to each and every one of you. I've been with SCSEP maybe three years and my understanding is that I think I'm in my third year, my understanding is that this has been, it's quite a decade of a journey. In reference to transitioning out of a system that many love, moving to this new system and all of the glitches and challenges of that. So, I really, really appreciate everyone's patience and I know you know, it was definitely a rocky road. So, thank you.
Thank you. Thank you.
And with that, we have been working really hard in reference to getting this system stabilized. And getting the things that are needed and that includes making sure that the system stabilized, that we have our data and that we have reports so that we can start moving to the enhancement stage of getting the next level of things that people need.
So, with that said, let me introduce Ali Slaughter. She is our team, all things performance. So, she's been brought on probably about two years now, in reference to helping us work with our GPMS system. And she's gonna give a report out of kind of where we're at today with GPMS.
So, Ali, if you don't mind, let us hear how we're doing in this area.

Slaughter, Alison S - ETA 11:47
Thanks so much, Toni, and good afternoon, everyone, and welcome to day three.
I think it's the best day all about performance.
Next slide please.
Before we jump into some details about where we're at with the system and where we're looking to go in the next calendar year, just a broad overview of the system that I know you all know so well. A large part of our SCSEP data world, is housed in our DOL provided case management system, GPMS or as we just learned, the grantee performance management system. All participant data is required to be entered into the application in an accurate and a timely manner. The data that is collected in GPMS is used for many reasons. We use it to track participant eligibility, services. they're provided and any outcomes. We use it to ensure that grant performance expectations are met. It helps us evaluate the successes and challenges of the program and helps us determine ways that we can improve. And then it also helps us complete reporting requirements, including the quarterly performance report, equitable distribution and the minority report, all things that we'll share in more detail later in this presentation.
Next slide please.
So I wanna provide some updates on the state of GPMS as it currently stands.
But first I wanna echo what Toni said and recognize the incredible patience and attention to detail and feedback our user community has had in the past few years

since the system went live. It's been a huge team effort to get the system to this point from our developers, our training team, our technical assistance providers and of course our users. So, thank you again for sticking with us. So now what has been completed in the system and what will we be focusing on in the next year? As you know, we spent a lot of the last year focusing on the internal QPR or quarterly performance report, to produce accurate data for quarterly exports and as a daily performance tool. So, we've put a lot of work into upgrading that, making sure our calculations were being done correctly and we hit that big milestone a few months ago. As I've learned with any reporting functionality, and as the team has shared even in the days of SPARQ, our legacy system, there's always new things that come up and we rely on our grantee community to help us report those things. So, we have one outstanding ticket at the moment to fix a calculation issue in the quarterly performance report, but other than that we've been receiving good feedback on the accuracy of that report. We also have a lot of other reports in the system that can help you track services and other admin items. We do have some enhancements and some fixes to these reports coming in the next few releases, so thank you again to all your feedback. But just to quickly run through some of those reports, we have our participant current and exited detail report, which helps you track your number of active participants, and also those that have recently exited. Our waiver of durational limit report. As we mentioned yesterday, helps us track individual duration. Participant hours report is a newer one. It's one of my favorites. It helps us see how many community service hours have been entered for an entire grantee and also for an individual, and more importantly, it tells us who hasn't had any hours entered into the system. We have our participant actions reports, which helps us track those PRA or participant required actions, that get done in the system. We have most in need and our waiver factor actions report, lovingly referred to as the MINWFAP report, that helps us track those annual updates. Follow-up gives us information on what has been completed and has not been completed when following up with an individual about their employment after exit. And then we have our assignment by host agency, which gives us more information on those partners that you work with in the Community and what participants are assigned to each host agency. Last, we have our equitable distribution, which is a little separate than some of our other reports, but that helps us track the authorized and the modified positions for each grantee.

How many you have enrolled to fill those slots, as we call them and where there might be some gaps in the way that you're serving the areas in your service area?

Next slide please.

So what are we going to focus on in the next year? We're looking to add some additional reporting tools for approved breaks and wait list and we're also going to be reassessing

the extracts that we have currently in the system.
What additional extracts may be needed?
So if you have any thoughts on extracts, we'd love to hear your feedback via Zendesk, so please share those with us. On that note, as we see more stabilization in the system, especially in our areas of reporting, we'll be working more on some of the highly requested enhancements that we have heard from you. All would make your lives easier in the system. So, to tease a few, these are some that are in our next few releases that we're working on currently. We're going to be adding things like adding median earnings to the follow up report. So instead of just having, you know, follow up two was successfully completed, you'll also be able to see the median earnings that come from that follow up two section. So, you don't actually have to go into each individual to find that information. Another one is allowing additional participants per page for the managed paid hours tool. So, you don't have to click next page as often and then we're also looking at automating the urban rule selection based on ZIP code. This falls in line both with making hopefully your lives easier, but also with ensuring that we have accurate data and that you know you're not missing out on any most in need characteristics based on the ZIP code that's there, so that will help us with some more accurate data. We want to know what else you wanna see in the system. The more Zendesk tickets we get on a subject, the higher up in our priority, it often moves. We can't guarantee that. We can include everything, but we certainly wanna hear that feedback. So sorry to our help desk team for potentially a lot of tickets in the coming days, but we'd love to hear your feedback and we wanna make sure that we're implementing those ideas that you have as you're the ones that are in the system most often.
Lastly, we have our wonderful training team has been working hard to prepare updated GPMS trainings for all users. We'll work to record those and replace what's currently on the CoP with all the new additions to the system included in that training. So, they'll be available live and then they'll also be available as a recording. They've been awesome supporting our user community through our vLive as needed and will continue those as needed to support our user community.
All right. With that, I want to turn it over to Ron to discuss some additional data sources that we use in the world of SCSEP data besides GPMS. Ron.

Ron Schack 19:07
Hi everyone. Next slide please.
So there is an array of additional data that we use in conjunction with the GPMS data in order to do multiple things. So, these data sources include the American Community Survey data at the county level. These are five-year county estimates for the number

and percent of those 55 and older that are out or below 125% of poverty and the number and percent of those below the poverty rate, and we use those, in which we'll get to later in developing, adjusting grantee performance as well as developing the minority report. Additional data that is used for those purposes include Bureau of Labor Statistics data. For unemployment rate by county and average weekly wage rate by county.
So as I mentioned, these data are used to set the equitable distribution of authorized positions, which we'll talk more about adjust performance goals for goal setting and performance evaluation and evaluate service trends in the minority report.
Next slide.

Slaughter, Alison S - ETA 20:39
Thanks so much, Ron.
All right. We are in our next section.
I do want to address two things briefly.
Toni, while we're waiting for, as we promised yesterday, we're working to get you those slides right now, so that you can take notes on the slides.

Wilson, Toni K - SCSEP 20:55
Yes, thank you, Ali.
Yeah. I wanted to just say that we're actually gonna be putting. We did promise and we're getting that in there cause I know some of you wanted the actual slides to be able to take notes. So that will be put into the chat momentarily. So, for those that needed that, just give us a moment on that piece and before we move to the section I wanted to answer a question if you don't mind.
Ali and Ron.
Is that?
Now I've lost it.
It was a great question, where'd it go?
There we go. The one about.

Slaughter, Alison S - ETA 21:31
That, what other?

Wilson, Toni K - SCSEP 21:31
Here it is.
What other?
Thank you.

Too many things going on.
What other U.S. DOL programs use GPMS as their case management system? As I said, thank you so much, Lisa, that's a great question. So, all of our ETA discretionary programs or I would say at least almost all. Those that are at the stage that SCSEP has been and is transitioning into, they're building there's out, and many of them have the luxury of having SCSEP's experience, so they can move a little faster than us, so that's a really great. But all of our discretionary. So, think things like you know Youth Build or a Rio or NNFJP is in transition. So, things of those sort all have it. All programs began the transition after WIOA enacted in 2018. Everyone basically had their own systems and DOL had transitioned to having this central, GPMS system based. And then what we're seeing is that we take what everyone has and then we need to make it work for our individual programs. So that as you can imagine, is where some of the challenges that we had because SCSEP is just has you know a lot more nuances and so maybe some of the other programs. So just wanted to flag that. All right. So let me pass this back to you, Ali. I think those are the questions that we at least have so far and thank you so much, Kevin, for throwing the slides in the chat.
So those are there for everyone.
All right, so back to part one.

Slaughter, Alison S - ETA 23:15
Thanks Toni.
So if you're going to be using the slides in the deck, we're starting with part one, SCSEP performance measures.
Next slide please.
So on the screen here we have all seven of our SCSEP performance measures and we have them grouped into 3 categories. We have our employment-based measures, our services to participant measures and our indicators of effectiveness measure. I'm gonna start with our employment-based measures and then I'll pass it on to Ron to review our other four measures. Just like the other two days of our orientation, this is more of a broad overview of performance and reporting. You'll see maybe a little bit more detail today then we've seen in our other two days just because of some of the nature of performance. But we are also working to update as we'll talk about later, our performance training materials, so that you have access to this offline, to be able to train your sub grantees or staff.
All right. Next slide please.
So there are two employment rate measures in SCSEP. They are measured first during the second quarter after exit and then during the fourth quarter after exit.
These measures the percentage of project participants who are in unsubsidized

employment during that indicated quarter, either second or fourth quarter after exit. To compute this, as you see on the screen there and our equation, we take the number of participants who are in unsubsidized employment, that is our yellow box there or our numerator and we divide that by the total number of Exeter's during the reporting period, that's our blue box down at the bottom, and then we multiply that by 100 to get our percentage. I do wanna note that in the bottom in the denominator that excludes anyone who exited with an exclusion, and we'll talk about that a little bit in our next slide. I do want to note that the amount of wages for this specific measure is irrelevant. Working even one hour or earning even $1.00 in the quarter counts, you don't have to have work the entire quarter for it to count that you were employed in the second quarter. Self-employment and temporary employment also account for this measure.
Next slide please.
So, these are the reasons that you can exit someone in GPMS. On the left-hand side are the reasons why someone would be included in our employment measures and then on the right we have those that are excluded in the employment rate measures. There are two categories for those exclusions, the first is if you received an exclusion. Those are things like if you, the participant is deceased. If they were institutionalized either incarcerated or in a medical facility. For a health or medical reason, if they're a reserved force called the active duty, or if they're ineligible at recertification due to income for those top four reasons, it has to be something that's gonna last more than 90 days. These are exclusions. All have very specific definitions, and they have to be accompanied by source documentation that's right now in our data validation handbook. So, you can learn more about those but do make sure that that it follows the definition and that you have the source documentation to back up the reason for an exclusion. The other type of exclusion that wouldn't be in the denominator is when a transfer occurs from a donor grantee to a recipient grantee. The donor record, the one who's giving up the participant in a way, the performance for that donor grantee is not included. So, the performance measure essentially gets transferred to the new recipient grantee. So that's another reason for exclusion.
Next slide please.
All right, we have a late quiz. So, let's take a look at timing and how this works out in terms of quarters. So, Maria completes her CSA and exits the program on October 25th, 2024. She begins her placement, or unsubsidized employment the following day on 10/26/24. When is her second quarter after exit? So, you could either, if you think you know you can drop it in the chat. You can either give it to me in terms of months, or you can tell me the corresponding quarter.

Wilson, Toni K - SCSEP 27:53

Excuse me for a second. Just to just a reminder, if you can please be put on mute if you're not speaking.
Thank you.

Slaughter, Alison S - ETA 28:03
Seeing some great responses in the chat, Jada, if you can advance there should be a chart that swipes on this page. There we go. So yes, you are correct. So, if they exit in October, which on the chart here we see is our PY 24 quarter two, then two quarters later would be PY 24 quarter four, also known as April to June. And then if we take that, two more quarters later to get our fourth quarter after exit, we get to PY 25 quarter two or October to December. So, fourth quarter is easy to calculate, right?
It's just one year later, second quarter can be tricky. I have this diagram with these quarters and months at my desk and I commonly have to refer to it just to give myself a visual of how to calculate that in my own. Our system helps us do that, but I always think it's useful to remember your quarters. All right. Great job everyone.
Next slide please.
So this is certainly not a comprehensive list, but here are some positive indicators for this measure. And if you have something else that you think of that relates to positive indicators or ways that you can diagnose performance, feel free to add that in the chat.
So, the first item is comprehensive assessments conducted during eligible determination and continuous management of a participant's IEP. This leads to a strong understanding of the barriers facing your participants, how you can address them, and what the participants goals are in the program, and then what services to provide them to help them reach those goals. Another indicator can be exiting for unsubsidized employment is often a positive indicator that they can remain employed and count in our second or fourth quarter after exit. However, as I note in the diagnosis section in the bottom half of this slide, just because a participant doesn't exit with unsubsidized employment doesn't mean that they can't be subsequently employed and still be counted as positive in second or fourth quarter.
So you don't have to exit for unsubsidized employment to, and if you're later, to be counted in that measure. So, we encourage that follow up two be completed on all participants, not just those who exited for unsubsidized employment. And lastly, this is going to be a theme throughout our entire presentation. Timely follow up and timely data entry. Entering data during the quarter that you're reporting on means that you have a higher chance of getting this information from the participant or the employer, and it keeps you on top of data entry. You know, the longer someone is out of a program, the harder it can be to locate them. And same with their employer.
So keeping up that relationship and then also conducting that follow up during the

actual quarter that you're reporting on is a really great indicator that you can get that information and entered into the system.
Next slide please.
All right. We're moving on to our third employment-based measure, which is median earnings. This measure looks at the median or middle wage of all participants who are employed during the second quarter after exit. So, the time period is the same reporting period for our second quarter after exit employment measure. The one change in this measure is that we actually report on wages during the third quarter after exit to allow for an accurate count of wages for the entire second quarter. So, what that means, is the time period is the same as second quarter employment after exit. However, you have to wait for their entire second quarter to be over to actually know how much money they made during that entire quarter. And so, we can't capture that until the third quarter begins. So, we're figuring out and finding out that information in third quarter, but we're talking about the time period for second quarter. We use the median value in this measure as opposed to an average because it allows for the measure to not be affected by huge outliers on either end. So, let's say you had a participant who made $20,000 in 1/4 or you had someone who only worked for, you know, two days they made $80.00 and they're at very, very low end. If we use the average, those high or low numbers could skew our earnings number, but by using the median value which if we take it back to our math classes, right, we line up all of the wages in order from smallest to largest and we find that middle value. If it's an even number and there are two middle values, and we average those out. But that allows us to not have any major outliers or skews in our data. So, if you look at our example here on the screen, you know if a subgrantee had nine participants who were employed during the two quarters after exit are middle wage, there is 3,156.
Next slide please.
So again, what are some positive indicators of median earnings? This may seem obvious, but the average wage in the number of hours of work a week can of course affect this measure. So, if they start off with a higher, you know wage will see a higher number throughout, likely their second quarter if they're still employed, although they can, you know gain more income. It's likely that if they start out with a higher wage, we're going to see that reflected in the measure, of course. And then a retention with that same employer, right? So, if they left or if they got employment and that's why they exited and they're still with that employer in their second quarter after exit, we see that as a positive indicator because they're likely that means that they're likely working the entire quarter and they, you know have wages for all of those days that you would expect them to have wages. If they leave a job and start a new one halfway through the quarter, we'll see less wages work on through that quarter. And again, of course, timely

and complete follow-ups are really important for making sure you can get the data correctly and then get it in the system. My biggest recommendation for diagnosing this performance is using the follow up report to identify undone or incomplete follow-ups. A common issue we've seen recently is that because we collect wages technically during the third quarter, that's done at two different times, right when we collect second quarter to see if they're employed and then when we collect their wages. So often we'll have a follow up one, which corresponds to second quarter after exit complete and then we'll have an uncomplete follow up two which corresponds to our wages. And so, we often see that a lower number of individuals in our meeting earnings as a result of that, we're gonna take a look at a QPR later on our presentation today and I'll be sure we'll look at that and see what it looks like. So, our follow up report is the best tool for that.
And again, we're gonna be adding media and earnings on to that report.
Hopefully that helps you diagnose where some of those issues may be.
Alright, I am going to turn it over now to Ron and he'll work on our service to participate measures.

Ron Schack 35:25
OK.
Next slide please.
All right.
So our next measure is service level and service level is the total number of participants served divided by a grantee's authorized positions. After adjusting for differences in minimum wage among the States and areas, we call this adjustment, we call that count modified positions and it's very simple. All we do is we divide the total number of participants served by the number of modified positions, and as you may be aware that that rate is often over 100%. And the goal? The goal for service level is often well over 100% and the reasoning behind that is, you have a certain number of modified positions but expect a certain customer flow where people are moving in and out of the modified positions over the course of the year. So, service level, there's an expectation that you're going to serve more people than the number of modified positions you have.
Next slide.
So, you can determine the total number of participants to serve throughout a program year, by multiplying the service level goal by the number of modified positions. So, for example, if you have a goal of 160 for your service level and you have 56 modified positions, if you multiply 56 by 160%, you got a goal of 90 distinct individuals served during the program year. You can also figure out how many additional participants you need to enroll by subtracting the number of participants carried over from the

participants serve goal and then dividing by 4. So, in this example of your participants to serve, goal was 90 and you had carried over 41 participants from the last program year. Then your enrollment goal is 49 and if you divide that by which is 90 - 41 and you divide that into 4, you get approximately 12 new enrollments during each quarter.
Next slide.
So there are some main drivers of performance. You know you want a balanced customer flow; you want sufficient exits to allow new participants to be enrolled, and in order for new participants to be enrolled, you want strong recruitment, right? So associated with that, you want a minimal number of open slots, and of course, in order to be ready to serve these new participants, you want strong relationships with your host agencies. So possible causes of low levels of performance on service level and effective outreach and recruitment. Insufficient exits to employment to allow for new enrollments. Again, if you have 49. If you have a certain number of modified positions, say 49 or 79 or whatever. If all you're doing is holding the same participants in those modified positions all program year, you're not going to meet your service level. There has to be a flow of new participants in, which means some of the old participants have to exit. And so other issues might be enrollment, processing taking too long, lack of suitable host agencies, or if you have a lot of participants that are kind of occupying a modified position but are inactive.
Next slide.
The next measure we have is community service and this is kind of a tricky one. This can give people some difficulty in understanding what it's actually measuring, what it really measures is the total number of hours of community service provided by SCSEP participants, divided by the number of hours of community service funded by the grant after adjusting for differences in minimum wage among the States and areas. Training hours, sick hours and participant required action hours are removed from the denominator. So, what we're doing is we're looking at all the total number of community service hours provided and dividing that by the number that the funding is sort of expect you to provide. And the funded amount is defined as modified positions by 21 hours a week, times the number of weeks in a report period, right. Which is each quarter we expect modified positions, times 21 hours a week times 13 weeks is 273. So, so we multiply the modified positions by 273 by the number of quarters we're looking at for any particular report period.
Next slide.
So again, with community service you need to be looking at balanced customer flow. It's really important to accurately and timely submit time sheets for participants so that those hours can be recognized in the measure. And again, you know, you don't want a lot of approved breaks in participation because you're if you're doing that, you're not

providing community service for those individuals you really want. In order to diagnose this, you really want to figure out what is restraining enrollment or hours. It might be that you have inadequate management tools to track hours and payroll processing time might be another issue. Approved breaks might be another issue.
Next slide.
So the next measure is service to most in need, and this measure is the number of most in need individuals served, or the total number of following characteristics for all participants divided by the number of participants served. So basically, what we do is we look at this array of most unique characteristics that are listed below and we count each one of the most in need characteristics that each individual participant were serving has and we divided by the number of participants served and it usually comes out. It's a number, not a percentage, and it's in the range of between two and four and a half, usually.
Next slide.
So I'm sorry, could you back up a slide, please?
So I just want to go over these most in need characteristics. So these are severe disability, frail, 75 or older age, eligible but not receiving benefits under title two of the Social Security Act, residing in an area with persistent unemployment and having severely limited employment prospects, limited English proficiency, low literacy skills, disability, residing in a rural area, veteran, low employment prospects, has failed to find employment after using services provided under title one of WIOA, homeless or at risk of homelessness or formerly incarcerated. So, if an individual has one of these, that's one count in the numerator for this measure. If an individual has ten of these.
That's 10 counts in the numerator for this measure. So that numerator, if you look at the numerator on the QPR for this measure, they're very large numbers because you're multiplying all of these most in need characteristics by the number of participants to get that numerator.
Next slide.
So it's this. This gets a little tricky because some of these characteristics you record at enrollment any later changes are only made in the characteristics section, and most of them wouldn't change, although some can. Veteran status, individual with a disability, homeless or at risk of homelessness, urban or rural, failed to find employment after using title one, low employment prospects, formally incarcerated. There are others that are updated during the recertification process. This is used for the waiver factor for the individual durational limit, and these include severe disability, frail, old enough but not receiving Social Security Title 2, severely limited employment prospects, limited English proficiency, low literacy status and 75-year-old.
Next slide.

So thinking about service level, clearly you want to be targeting individuals with priority of service populations, right? But you want to be trying to serve individuals that may have one or more priority of service may have multiple barriers, right? You want to identify a holistic approach to conducting and take an assessment and clearly you want to obtain and document the information to establish a barrier, and you want to, during the recertification process, make sure you're updating the waiver factors because you might identify new barriers that hadn't been identified previously. So, the biggest thing we see with this measure is the lack of understanding of definitions and guidance and that leads to both under and over reporting of barriers. And you do want to see whether you're reaching your target populations. You want to look at your demographics and determine, you know, are we actually getting to the priority of service populations, we need to and then you want to diagnose that what you know, what can we do to reach those populations?

Next slide.

The last measure is actually a suite of three measures called indicators of effectiveness and indicators of effectiveness are measures of indicators of effectiveness and serving employers, host agency and participants. And what we do is we survey each of those three groups, employers, host agency and participants and we get an American customer satisfaction index score. For each of those three groups, it's three questions provided on a single weighted scale from 0 to 100, and then they're aggregated to a single average score for each participant. The surveys ask questions about critical aspects of services to customers to gain insight and improve service delivery.

Next slide.

So the participant and host agency surveys both use a random sample approach, and we draw that random sample from the records that were active in the last year in GPMS. OMB One has set a standard of a 70% response rate for these surveys, which is a very high standard. And that means that grantees and subgrantees have to do their part to keep that response rate up, this includes cleaning up bad addresses, mail addresses for participants, and main contact e-mail addresses for host agencies and sending pre survey letters to those in the sample. Because we found over the many of over the 20 years of doing this, we found that those pre survey letters really matter. It both alerts the customers that the survey is coming, and it provides legitimacy to the survey effort. The employer survey is redesigned to more closely align with the WIOA employer measure and will not be evaluated in PY 25, but we will be over the next several months piloting the new approach for subsequent implementation.

Next slide.

So I'm not sure if this is me or you Ali, I think it's you.

Slaughter, Alison S - ETA 49:51
Yeah, I can take it.
Thanks Ron.

Ron Schack 49:53
OK. Thanks.

Slaughter, Alison S - ETA 49:53
That was a great overview.
So again, as our theme with our performance measures, grantee's responsibilities include entering all data timely in GPMS, including enrollments, assignments, additional services, updating the IEP, paid hours, recertification, placement follow-ups, etcetera. All of that data has to be entered timely. Your other responsibilities with the performance measures include running GPMS reports to identify any gaps in your data or however your grantee decides to manage, making sure all of your data is entered in the system. We recommend GPMS reports and ensuring that all of your subgrantees are complying with data entry requirements. We often see grantees who have multiple Subs who have some really high performing subgrantees and some subgrantees who could use some additional assistance. So being able to run those reports at the subgrantee level will help you determine who you might need to offer some TA to or additional training and then analyzing your quarterly data, that will soon be submitted to WIPS, we'll talk about that in a bit. For areas of low performance and how you can improve and reaching out to your FPO for any assistance, there is a difference between the requirement to just, you know submit your QPR or enter all your data. Also taking the time and we'll talk about the notion of continuous improvement to see what's going on with your grantee and come up with ways to improve that and that's why your FPO is here. That's why our National Office staff is here to help you figure out those ways that you can improve.
All right. With that, I will pause and turn over to Toni for some Q&A.

Wilson, Toni K - SCSEP 51:39
Thank you so much, Ali.
Thank you so much, Ron.
I appreciate you both.
Let's see.
Let's start with some Q&A. Just in this section.
So one I believe.

We'll start with you, Ron, first on this.
So Ali, you may jump in.
Can you provide the reference source of where the funded amount is defined?

Ron Schack 52:06
I'll have to. I'll have to.

Wilson, Toni K - SCSEP 52:06
Not quite sure.

Ron Schack 52:08
I'll have to look that up and get it back to you. I think it's probably in The Reg, but I'll look that up.

Wilson, Toni K - SCSEP 52:11
Alright.
No worries, Ron. We got you covered and we're putting that in the chat.
Which is the and Ali did you want to add anything?

Slaughter, Alison S - ETA 52:25
Yeah, I think this also relates really well to another question that was asked about the difference between APs and MPs. So actually, I don't know if we can start there first Ron, with answering what are APs and what are MPs? And how are those different? And then I can add some additional context to the funding amount question.

Ron Schack 52:45
Sure. Authorized positions are the number of positions that a grantee is funded to provide, right. So, it's based on a certain dollar amount per position. So, you have your total funded amount, and you divide your total funded amount by a specific dollar amount per position and you get your total modified positions. Our look at the minimum wage that's required in the state or states that our grantee operates in and also actually it goes down to county and municipal too and it adjusts the total number of authorized positions downward based on anywhere where a grantee would have to pay higher than the federal minimum wage. So, you might have 100 authorized positions, but because you're paying more than the federal minimum wage and certain jurisdictions, your total modified positions would be lower, could be 75 or 80.

Slaughter, Alison S - ETA 54:09

Thanks, Ron. And so that all has to do with how much money you receive, right? And those are the equations that you can find in those allotment TEGLs, based on the cost per participant, which is established not by our office, but it is included in those TEGLs. And so the point of the community service measure is to make sure that it's looking right at how many hours could you provide based on the funds you have and so that funded amount takes into account the modified positions and then based on how many of those you have, how many hours it's expected based on the definition of part time work and community service assignment, that's expected.

Wilson, Toni K - SCSEP 54:57
Sorry, coming off mute.
Thank you so much to both of you.
All right. So, then we've answered those two.
Our next question is around most in need.
What participants, who may be sensory impaired, what factor classification would these participants be placed in? We have LEP as the option, but not LEP-SI.
Ron or.

Ron Schack 55:31
I'm not sure.

Wilson, Toni K - SCSEP 55:32
Either or. OK.
We can all follow up on that one.

Ron Schack 55:34
Yeah.

Wilson, Toni K - SCSEP 55:36
Let's see.
So another question and one that I can answer. So, while you guys are, we'll look back around to that answer. I believe, Rachel, you asked that we'll loop back around if we can get that before the end of the day, we'll put it in and if not, we'll have that in our FAQ.
There was an earlier question which I can answer, which is Ron, you mentioned the minority report which prompted. Deborah to ask will we receive any guidance on whether or not we'll be required to adhere to this or would you rather I contact my FPO, depose that question? I thank you for putting that option there, Deborah, I really do and

regularly I would say yes, but I can say that you know, the minority report and the equitable distribution are all statutory requirements. So, because of that, we are still continuing until you know if or when we get any additional guidance on that, we will definitely be sure to share that with you and that will come from your FPOs. But right now, because it's a statutory, we do have to continue. So just wanted to let people know that.
All right. Let's see our next question.

McNeace, Meche - ETA CTR 57:01
Yeah.

Wilson, Toni K - SCSEP 57:03
All right, Ali, there's a question in reference to veteran and spouse of a veteran are only a priority of service, not. I think it's minimal or MIN.

Slaughter, Alison S - ETA 57:16
Most in need characteristic.

Wilson, Toni K - SCSEP 57:18
Most in Need. I'm sorry.
Thank you.
Thank you.

Slaughter, Alison S - ETA 57:20
Yeah, great question.
Correct me if I'm wrong, Ron, but it's not a most in need characteristics. However, it is a priority of service, and we have that in our, these are great questions, you guys are making me do a quick control F in our regs. Yes, they are a priority, both a veteran and a spouse and a veteran are a priority population. And so that's why you see that in our when you're entering data in GPMS, and I believe we also capture that on our QPR. So, you can see how many veterans you're serving.

Wilson, Toni K - SCSEP 57:51
Right. OK. I think we've answered all of the ones for at least this section. And if not, we will have another opportunity to get to some more Q&A. So, if you are thinking of some additional ones, please be sure to put those in the chat. All right.
Next slide.
Right. So, we're gonna jump into Part 2, which is the goal setting and performance

evaluation.
I'm gonna hand this over to you, Ron.

Ron Schack 58:27
OK.
Next slide please.
Alright, so the department negotiates expected levels of core performance of the core performance measures with SCSEP grantees on a 2-year basis. And that starts with developing a proposed goal for each of the measures for each of the grantees, and in reaching these proposed levels of performance, the department considers past performance comparability levels across grantees. Wouldn't want them to be too disparate or too varied, adjusted using an objective statistical adjustment model.
And we're also trying to improve performance and promote continuous improvement. So, we wouldn't just want to rest on laurels and use past performance as the guide. We want to have some reach or stretch involved in what we're trying to achieve. So, grantees can engage in a negotiation process using supporting data to further adjust the goals.
Next slide.
So when we go through this goal adjustment process, we use an objective statistical adjustment model, as SAM, to adjust expected levels of performance for the three employment measures based on economic conditions and participant characteristics that have the most clear-cut impact on performance. So economic factors are looked at the county level and then aggregated grantee level. They're compared to the nationwide average for the poverty level, unemployment rate and average weekly wage rate. The SAM identifies characteristics that have a statistically significant effect on employment outcomes. Examples of characteristics from last year include, for second employment in the second quarter, if you had a higher percentage, a statistically higher percentage of males, your goal was slightly reduced. If you had a higher percentage of displaced homemakers, your goal was slightly reduced. If you had a higher percentage of participants with bachelor's degrees or master's degrees, your goal was slightly increased in a similar way for employment in the fourth quarter. The one that's different there is. We had all three of the ones for employment in the second quarter, but if you had a higher percentage of individuals at or below the poverty level, that would be a further reduction in that goal. And then median earnings, you have percent male and interestingly, for median earnings, if you have a higher percentage of males, the goal is adjusted upward, because males tend to earn more than females. Percent disabled, you would be adjusted downward. Percent with advanced degree, you would be adjusted upward. Percent receiving public assistance, you would be adjusted

downward. So, we look at both the economic characteristics and the participant characteristics and we adjust the goals accordingly. We do that when we create the proposed goals and then we also do it again when we evaluate performance at the end of the program year.
Next slide.
So as I referenced, DOL assesses performance annually based on each program year's final performance data.
The statistical adjustment models refreshed, and the performance goals are adjusted to reflect the actual economic conditions and characteristics of participants in the corresponding program year. Actual performance is compared to goals as aggregated after adjusting goals based on economic conditions and participant characteristics.
Just as a note, in the current grant cycle only one grantee has failed to meet 80% of the agreed upon level of performance in the aggregate across all of the measures.
Next slide.
The grantee fails to meet the expected levels of performance if they fall below 80% in the aggregate of the percent of goal achieved. Grantees who fail performance must submit a corrective action plan, and technical assistance will be provided. Any national grantee that has failed to meet expected levels of performance for four consecutive years will not be allowed to compete in the next grant competition. Any state grantee that fails to meet the expected levels of performance for three consecutive years, will not be required to compete to award the funds allotted to the state grantee.
Performance and negotiated goals are publicly available on the department's older worker website.
Next slide.
So in summary for goal setting, you should review the National Office proposed goals and accept the goals or communicate intent to negotiate. If negotiating, you need to collect and submit data that supports an additional goal adjustment, then present the data to the National Office for review. As far as grantee performance evaluations go, of course you want to enter all collected data timely via GPMS, to be included in the evaluation and if the aggregate percent of goal achieved is below 80% on the evaluation, you need to complete and implement the required corrective action plan.
Next slide.
So back to Toni and Ali.

Wilson, Toni K - SCSEP 1:04:51
Thank you so much for that Ron, I appreciate you.
I gotta let you know, guys, if you're ever in an airport or something and you see Ron, I encourage you to buy him a cup of coffee and pick his brain. He's got a head full of great

performance knowledge. You can learn a lot from him, so thank you so much for that.
All right, let's do some Q&A.
Before we move to, I believe we have a break after this. Let's do some Q&A first.
So if you didn't put in the chat and you had some questions, please put those in the chat. We're going to do the questions based on the information on today's presentation so far. If you have something outside of that, you could still put in the chat, but we'll answer those at the end of our day three. So, with that said, let's see what we have here.
All right, just give me a second to just make sure I'm answering questions in the.
Alright, so there was a question about a question on most in need, what participants who may be sensory impaired, what factor classification would these participants be placed in? We have LEP as an option, but not LEP/SI. I know I've asked that question before, so I know, it's not a mistake. I know I read this before, but we got the answer there. It says sensory impaired can be considered as a disability, so just wanted to make sure that we close the loop on that. If you were looking for something in additional in that question, just please put that back into the chat. We appreciate that.
All right. Our next question I believe will be for you, Ron. Could you explain why the rate would drop based on the percentage of males? Please advise.

Ron Schack 1:06:49
Because when we run the statistical adjustment model, we put all those characteristics in to a big regression equation and we basically regress all those different characteristics and economic factors against the outcome we're looking at like the second quarter after employment after that set and what happens is we run that regression and the characteristics that come out of that regression equation that matter, that are significantly associated with the outcome, are the ones we use to adjust. So, in the case of percent male, there's a clear negative relationship between being male and being successful on that second quarter. After that, said employment rate. So, because there's a negative correlation, we then use that to downward adjust the goal for percent because if you have a high percentage of males in your participant population significantly different than the average.

Wilson, Toni K - SCSEP 1:08:17
OK.
Thank you so much, Ron.
Appreciate that.
Let's see. Emmanuel, I see you have a few follow up questions. One was the question that we just asked in reference to the sensory impair. There was a follow up. Would that not be considered disabled? So, the question, repeating it one more time, was in

reference to the most in need. With participants who may be sensory impaired, what factor clarifications would these participants be placed in? We have an LEP as the option, but not LEP-SI. So, the follow up to that is, would that not be considered disabled? Because our answer was since re impaired can be considered as disabled. I'm not sure we might need to look.

Slaughter, Alison S - ETA 1:09:08
I think I think, yeah, I think Emmanuel's just confirming what I think that was before the response that he was asking is wouldn't that be counted as a disability?

Wilson, Toni K - SCSEP 1:09:09
Sorry, you go ahead, Ali.

Slaughter, Alison S - ETA 1:09:17
So yes, you're correct, Emmanuel.

Wilson, Toni K - SCSEP 1:09:19
Alright, alright.
Sorry about that, but wanna make sure that your question was answered there, so hopefully that helped there Emmanuel, and I see you had one more question. I did not hear the priority of services are calculated into the most in need score on the QPR. I would like to confirm. Confirm that please.

Ron Schack 1:09:38
Yes, there are 14 things that are counted in most in need, including some of the priority of services. Veterans is one of them, low employment prospects, having failed to find employment right. Most of these are customer characteristics and not necessarily priorities of service, but veterans are.

Slaughter, Alison S - ETA 1:10:04
Thanks, Ron. And yeah, I apologize.
I misspoke earlier. Veterans are both a most in need characteristic and a priority of service. So, they are included in that calculation of the most in need measure.
So thanks for confirming wrong.

Ron Schack 1:10:18
You're welcome.

Wilson, Toni K - SCSEP 1:10:19
So much alright.
I don't see any other questions so far on this.
Am I missing anything?
Just one quick gut check from the group.
I think we got everything. We have a few things that we'll answer at the end of the day. They're outside of this. Once again, if you have any, you can put those in the chat, but it's about 2:15. We're just going to take a 15-minute break.
If you do the next slide, please. Just to give everybody a chance to stretch, get away from the screens for a second. And then when we return, we're going to get into reporting. So, we'll see everybody in a few. Thank you.

Slaughter, Alison S - ETA 1:27:01
All right.
Welcome back everyone.
Thank you for bringing back up the slides, Jada.
And we can go on to the next slide please.
Great. So, our third section of today is going to be covering QPR reporting. So, we'll be talking about quarterly performance reports, including looking at one together today.
Next slide please.
The quarterly performance report or QPR, summarizes information on a grants participants, services and performance indicators. The data can be gathered at the nationwide, the grantee and the subgrantee level. Official QPRs are submitted quarterly and an annual QPR summarizes all four quarters of every program year.
We also have tools available to run these reports more frequently to help you understand where your performance stands prior to finalizing the report.
Next slide please.
So in just a minute, I'm gonna ask Jada to pull up an example of a QPR, but let's start by going over each section. So, the QPR has five main sections. Our top section is our grant overview section. It has information on the grantee, a subgrantee, if that's applicable, and then it has your authorized and modified positions listed on there.
So that's a great place to see if you have a difference in your authorized and modified positions. If you have some areas where the minimum wage is higher than the nationwide minimum wage or you can see that those match and then it also gives us information about our average project duration. I know that was a question yesterday about how to know what your average project duration is. That's all reported in our top section of the QPR. Section A is all about demographics. It's titled participant summary

information, so it has identifying information like sex, age, ethnicity and race, and our education. And then it has those most in need characteristics. Section B is about all about our core performance measures. So, it lists our 7 core performance measures we pull in, the one we're going to look at in a second, the goals for those measures, and then what your actual performance is.
Section C is our participation level information. It has data about your enrollment and your Exeter data, and then our last section is sort of a catch all or summary part of information. We have data on training and community service data.
All right. Jada, can I have you please pull up our example QPR?

McNeace, Meche - ETA CTR 1:29:55
It's coming, Ali.

Slaughter, Alison S - ETA 1:29:57
No worries.
Thanks, Jada.
The one we're gonna look at today is the QPR from GPMS. This is our PY 23, end of year or EOY QPR for the entire nation. So, I'll point a few things out. We can see there, are grant overview section. This is a nationwide, it's reporting on all grantees together. So that's our grantee and we don't have a specific sub listed. If this was a grantee QPR, you could see your code and your grant number there as well. There we can see our number of authorized positions and modified positions in columns F&G, and I think that this is a great place to see how much of a difference there is. There are a lot of areas where our minimum wage is higher than the nation minimum wage. We're at just under 3000 modified, sorry 30,000 modified positions and we have almost 40,041 thousand authorized positions. And then directly to the right of that, we have our average project duration year to date. So, from the last four quarters and then we also have last nine quarters and that is in days. All right, if we can scroll down a bit, Jada, to show all of section A or as much as we can. You'll notice that only two out of the six columns there are filled out or have data. That's because this is an end of year QPR. If you pulled it for, let's say the current quarter PY 24, quarter three, you would see data in all of the quarters, but because the end of the year is the same as year to date and last four quarters. We just complete the data one time. So that's what you see here. But if you had like a quarter three QPR, you would see data in each of those and those numbers would look different based on that timeline that it's pulling from. If you can scroll just about halfway down. So, we can see the bottom of the participant, summary information. I want to point out that most in need characteristics section there, under 5 and we can see veterans, an eligible spouse, a veteran. So, you can see both the

individual number of participants and then the column G represents that the percentage of participants all right. And then if we can move to Section B, please. Here we have all of our SCSEP core measures, you'll see the same thing you only see year to date, but if you had pulled something besides an end of year QPR you would see all of those columns completed. For those measures, we see the rate next to the goal and then below that we have the numerator and denominator. So, it gives you the actual number of those in each of those equations. We can keep scrolling the second half of this is our employment rate measures. Again, we'll have our rate numerator and a denominator and then at the very bottom we have section C&D which gives us some helpful information about Exeter's enrollments, community service placement. I hope this all looks familiar to you. I hope you've had this in front of you before. We're gonna talk a little bit in this section about analyzing your performance in your QPR, but we're certainly gonna have some more resources and training on a deeper dive into this cause you can gain a lot of information from the QPR that can be really helpful in the continuous improvement cycle.

Alright, thanks so much, Jada.

Can we move back to the PowerPoint please?

And next slide.

So we're gonna start with the GPMS QPR.

There are two places right now where you can access the QPR and there will continue to be two places to access the QPR. This is what we're all most familiar with and that's the document that we just had up in the screen. It's available at the grantee, subgrantee level and then nationwide. And it can be run for a single quarter or an entire program year. We were looking at an end of year or entire program year QPR.

Our grantee admins in GPMS. Last week, during our WIPS training that involved in the transition to WIPS, which is the Workforce Integrated Performance System, it's the joint ETA system that we're going to begin reporting in that allows us to get access to wage data. Because of that wage matching process, there is a two-quarter lag in the reporting of our employment-based measures. We'll talk about it in the next slide to see that, or next two slides to see the timing. So, there is a difference for the three employment-based measures we are going to leave for now, at least the GPMS QPR as is, without that lag in the reporting periods. And I think this will be a great forecasting tool you'll be able to see two quarters ahead of time, where your performance stands so that you know by the time two quarters later you have to submit final performance data, you have a sense of where you're at and you've had time to improve those measures. Again, this is only for employment-based measures, as we'll see the time frame for the other four is still the same.

Next slide please.
So like I mentioned, we just had our WIPS training last week with all of our grantee administrators, who are the folks that have the permissions to submit a WIPS that is now up on our CoP. So, if you're interested and wanna watch it, we welcome you to. Grantees will, we hope, or may begin submitting data into WIPS this February, but we're transitioning to WIPS throughout the next program year, so we'll continue using GPMS QPRS and data as our official performance record PY 24, as we begin to make that switch to WIPS. As there are some changes involved, including that two-quarter leg, I want to note that the data elements on the QPR are identical. However, there are two differences in how the data is reported. The second one, here we already talked about those employment-based measures have the two-quarter lag for the Community service measure. We had to update that equation back in the last summer to account for sick hours and PRA hours being moved from the denominator to keep up to date with the way that GPMS records that information. It's updated in GPMS, so you'll see accurate data for your community service measure. WIPS is still working on updating that and we hope to have that updated in the system by PY 25 and that's part of our, you know, eventual transition to the WIPS system by the next program year.
Next slide please.
All right, so let's talk a little bit more about this reporting period changes between the QPR in GPMS and the QPR in WIPS. And if this starts to hurt your head a little bit, you are not alone. Reporting periods are one of the hardest things I think in performance and it still it still gets to my head sometimes too. So, let's start off with the easy thing. Service level, community service and most in need are what we call live indicators or active participant indicators, so they are reporting on participants who are active in the quarter, that's being reported on. So that is, that's the same between GPMS and WIPS. You're looking at if the reporting period is PY 24, quarter three or current quarter, you're reporting on folks that were active in that quarter for our employment-based measures, we also call them exit based indicators. So instead.
Of reporting on folks that are active, we're looking at participants who exited in that same reporting period. And the change again between GPMS introduces that two-quarter lag. So, what hasn't changed is when someone's second quarter or fourth quarter after exit falls. So, we looked at that example with Maria earlier in our slides. Trying to figure out how to calculate when is two quarters after exit and when is four quarters after exit. That stays the same. What changes is that you just wouldn't see that participant until two quarters later. So, we're just changing the like cohort of Exeter's that are in our report. But we're not changing when those measures actually take place. So that's an important distinction. Nothing with the equation has changed. It's just when you see those participants being reported on, we introduce this in our WIPS

training last week. It's available in our CoP, and I definitely encourage you to reach out to your GA if you have more questions on this, but we have a tool to help show you the difference between GPMS and the WIPS QPR.
And also lets you pick 1/4 that you're gonna be reporting in and it shows you who is gonna be included in that. So that's a great tool if you're looking at, let's say you know needing to clean up data or double check data before you make it final. One other note, the WIPS QPR are available based on 1/4 of Exeter's an active participants, which follows what we are currently reporting on in SCSEP. But WIPS also has something called rolling four quarter basis, which is something new for us and we'll be talking about that more as we continue the transition to WIPS. Essentially, instead of just taking one quarter worth of data, we take four quarters, the last four quarters worth of data and we average it out to a performance measure.
So there are pros and cons to reporting on both having more data and averaging it out again helps us with some of those like outliers, 1/4 that might have been a struggle for your grantee, but it also includes that we're going farther back in time for when we report on data so we'll definitely share more information about that as we begin to get data from our web system. And again, I encourage you if you have questions about this, speak to your grantee administrator and GPMS, you can review those with recorded training, and we'll have additional materials to come on this.
Next slide please.
So I've I briefly talked about this before. QPR are vital in the continuous improvement cycle of your grant, so we encourage you to not only generate your QPR every quarter and in between as you're seeing where you're at, but also take the time to analyze it and if needed, discuss it with your FPO and they can, you know, pass any questions on to the National Office as well based on what your QPR is saying, there are many areas that you can consider and review. These include your recruitment policies, changes in customer characteristics, external conditions and more work to include your staff on the ground to get their firsthand knowledge as well as share and learn from your peers or other SCSEP grants. You can compare to other SCSEP grantees. You can compare to our numbers to see how you stand opposed to all other grantees, and then again, you know, we all know that our staff who are entering the data and working with the participants they have, you know, awesome knowledge to share with us about what might be going on in the ground, can help us with improving our programs. So, in the spirit of that, let's take a look at a few examples of how to interpret your QPR.
Next slide please.
All right. So, in this first example, let's say that your QPR shows a rate for community service well below your goal. So, what are other QPR fields that we could look at to help diagnose why the rate is low? I have a few examples here on this screen that we're going

to talk through, but if there's anything else that you think of that you looked at before or you think would be useful, feel free to add that in the chat. So, there are often two reasons for a low community service goal. The first one is that enrollment can be low, which leads to fewer CSA hours, right? Because as Ron helped describe that the Community service measure is really looking at how many hours your participants are providing and comparing that to what you could provide. If you have fewer participants that are in your program, then you're supposed to have or that you're funded for of course you're going to have fewer CSA hours to identify that you can see if your service level is also lower than its goal. That is usually a good indication if both of those measures are low, that it is because you have a low enrollment. You can also look to see the current participant in vacancy field in section C, if you remember, from the QPR that we just had up, to see how your number is compared to your modified positions. So, every grantee has different number of modified positions, so it. You can't always just look at the number of vacancies and get a good sense. You often have to take like a percentage to see you know how many fewer positions or how many vacancies do you have available. So that's a great place to look to indicate if it might be an enrollment issue. The other most common issue for why a community service measure may be low is that data is missing from the system. If your service level and enrollment goal is exceeding, you can look instead at the training hours number in section D, to see if it's lower than expected. Not all grantees provide training, but if you do and you're thinking that the number might be a little low, that's a good indication it could be a data entry issue, and then I would encourage you to go run a paid hours report or the PHR report and you can toggle on that zero hours filter to see if there are individuals who have no hours reported in GPMS, that should have hours reported in GPMS. That's a pretty common thing we see, especially towards the end of 1/4. So that's a good indication that it might be a data issue as opposed to an enrollment issue. So that's just one example of how you can use other fields on a QPR to try and diagnose what might be going on with a low performance measure.

I think we're doing OK on time, so let's go to the next slide and we'll look at another example.

This one is about the most in need measure. So, if that rate is also looking well below what your goal is, a section on the QPR that I would go to first is the demographic section, specifically those most in need characteristics, that were in eight to five and there are a couple of questions that you can ask to try and diagnose it under reporting. So is there a demographic category that either contains zeros or is lower than expected. You all know your service areas really well. If you operate in a highly rural area and that most of new characteristic is much lower than you would expect, that could be an indication that maybe there's some under reporting going on or incorrect reporting.

Saying someone lives in an urban area as opposed to a rural area, are there, you know, areas that it seems like staff may just not understand the definition of it and they're under reporting it. You can also look to see how your rates compared to either the nationwide QPR or look at a previous quarter in your service area. Go back, you know, a year or two or even just in the last quarter and see if you notice any big changes or big drops in those percentages of participants. And then as I mentioned earlier, we often see that you know an area with high number of subgrantees might have some that are really excelling and others that are struggling. So, you can pull your QPR based on different, each subgrantee and see, you know, is one in a similar service area you know, are they reporting a high number of low employment prospects whereas another sub grantee seems to not be documenting any folks with that most of new characteristic, and maybe that's training issue that needs to be addressed with your subgrantee. So, that demographics section comparing both to other QPRs and also seeing if it doesn't quite seem right with your service area is a great place to try and diagnose that most in need fields. I will note, like Ron talked about with the measure, some most in need characteristics are only documented one time at the beginning of eligibility. Others require recertification. So, what we'll also see is that that case managers have documented them at eligibility, but they haven't completed the recertification. It's overdue, and that can affect your most in need number as well. All right, let's do one more example and then we'll wrap up this section.

Next slide please.

So median earnings, let's say your median earnings rate is much lower than your goal. I would recommend comparing it to your employment rate quarter two goal because this is the same time period where both of these measures are looking at quarter two or second quarter after exit. They are highly related. The way it sort of translates is that the numerator or the top of the equation in quarter two employment after exit, which represents anyone who has subsidized employment should be the count of those in or rate of those in your median earnings who have wages. So, if we remember, back to the QPR, the way that the median earnings section looks like it gives you that median value of your wages and then also gives you a count of participants that are included in that measure. And if that is not matching your numerator and section in the quarter 2 field either lower or higher, it mean that something is probably up in your follow-ups and like we talked about earlier, you may have completed follow up one but follow up two is missed or sometimes the opposite and so you want to make sure, that both of those are completed and because those numbers should be matching up. So those are just a couple examples. Again, we're working on getting you more materials about, you know, continuous improvement diagnosing your QPR, especially now that we have more access to those. So, we'll work to have examples for all of those. For all of our

measures and how you can use QPR for that and we'd love to hear from you too if there's ticks or tricks or tips that you've learned in analyzing your QPR that could help other grantees.
Next slide please.
All right. So, in summary, what is your responsibility as a grantee when it comes to the QPR? Again, as we've talked about many times, entering all of your collected data timely into GPMS, can be included in the QPR, both the QPR and GPMS and the WIPS QPR are both using data from GPMS, so anything that's not in the system we can't include in performance and that also includes getting in on time, right when we freeze that QPR when that QPR is submitted to WIPS, anything not in that time frame will not be included and then running reports to understand where your performance stands throughout each quarter and doing that prior to that finalization. Usually, we're at about six weeks out from the quarter end when we look to freeze or finalize our performance data. So, make sure you're writing reports throughout the quarter when it's actually happening. And then in the six weeks leading up to that finalization to make sure you have a good sense of where you're at and figure out what data might be missing. And then last is submitting your WIPS QPR on time as we talked about last week in our training. if you don't have your QPR in time in WIPS then you can't be included in that wage matching process as all files are sent together. So, make sure that you are submitting your QPR on time.
Great. With that, I will pause.
Turn it back over to Toni and see if we have any questions that we can answer.

Wilson, Toni K - SCSEP 1:50:17
I thank you so much, Ali.
Great information, I know this is a piece that a lot of people have a lot of good questions and wanting some good information on. So, if you do have any questions, please put those in the chat on this section. As I said, we'll be answering anything outside of this at the end, but if you have some questions for Ali, we can get some of those answered now.
So I'm gonna start out with.
So, Ali, so glad we are reviewing the QPR.
So I love that already, right?
My concern has been that it's been incorrect for a while. When can we expect these to be correct?
Thank you.
So basically is the QPR.

How would you describe it in the sense of I'm looking at the QPR, how confident should I be in the data?

Slaughter, Alison S - ETA 1:51:18
Great question. I know this has been a long time coming and a question that we often get asked. As I mentioned earlier, we do have one outstanding ticket related to the QPR that a grantee reported. I believe it's addressing quarter two, although someone on the team can correct me if that's incorrect. So, there is one issue that we are looking to address. Otherwise, we have not received reports in our testing. We haven't found other issues with the QPR. Again, if you find something that looks different or looks off, please, please communicate that. And then once we are to the point where we've, which we kind of are at, you know saying QPR is accurate, it stabilized, we encourage you to run it. We're going to be working on being more transparent if there is an issue that does get reported that we see across all grantees so that we can so that you know. When you're running QPR, if there's something that we're working on currently that would be causing your data to not look correct. So now that we finally are to that sort of solid-state with our QPR, we'll figure out a way to be able to communicate if there is something that we're seeing that's off and that we're being that's being addressed. I do want to note, as I think this came up last week or I can see it coming up, without getting too technical, the process for calculating the WIPS in GPMS and the process for calculating it in WIPS is same equations, but they're different systems that are doing the calculations. So, because there is an issue with the QPR in GPMS does not mean the same issue is applicable on WIPS. So just keep that in mind. We send essentially like participant or like grantee level data to WIPS and then they do the calculations on their end in GPMS.
Our system is the one that's calculating it, and so because there's different processes at play with different systems. They're not always gonna, if there's an issue in one, it doesn't mean the other one has the same issue. So, I just wanna throw that out there if you're wondering and looking through those two different QPRs.

Wilson, Toni K - SCSEP 1:53:31
Thank you so much, Ali.
I would just Add all of the tickets that go in with the issues.
That helps us a lot. And you know, once things are out in the field, we can better assess if there are any challenges and what we need to work on. So please continue to communicate through those help desk tickets cause that's how we know what's going on out in the field, or at least most of it. Maybe not all, but most of it.

All right. So, there's another question here for you, Ali again.
So, the rate is where the grantee is compared to the goal?

Slaughter, Alison S - ETA 1:54:10
The question, I'm pulling up the key here on my side just so I can see. So yeah, the rate is your number for that measure. So, in our example that Jada had pulled up, I'm just looking at the same QPR, the rate for service level was 142.8% and the goal nationwide, but this would if you pulled one for your own grantee would be the goal that was negotiated and agreed upon was 136. So, we surpassed our goal of service level in PY 23. So that's what it's being compared to, the rate versus the goal. And then as Ron talked about in his section, during that grantee evaluation process, we include an adjustment if it's found to be significant in your performance based on characteristics and economic factors. Your goal is the one that would be adjusted, not your actual performance, so we never change your actual performance, what we would adjust is the goal. Great question.

Wilson, Toni K - SCSEP 1:55:07
Alright. And our next one.
So it's for you also Ali. So, when we transition to WIPS, for example, if a job is secured in PY 23 quarter two, the fourth quarter after the quarter exit is PY 24, quarter 2. But since there is a two-month lag, we will not get the results until PY 24 quarter 4. Do I need to repeat that question, or you got it?

Slaughter, Alison S - ETA 1:55:37
I see it in the chat, yeah.

Wilson, Toni K - SCSEP 1:55:39
Yes.

Slaughter, Alison S - ETA 1:55:41
Ron fact checked me. cause. I'm. I'm doing this quickly in my head. But yes, I believe that's correct. So, the individuals fourth quarter after exit falls a year after they exit.
So it would be PY 24 quarter two. That individual would not be in our reporting period until we report on PY 24 quarter 4.
Is that correct, Ron?

Ron Schack 1:56:04
Yes.

Slaughter, Alison S - ETA 1:56:05
OK, awesome. Yes.
So that's exactly that's a great example Rick, of how the it doesn't change when their fourth quarter after exit is, but it does change when we see them in our QPR or in our reports. So, thanks for that great example.

Wilson, Toni K - SCSEP 1:56:21
Right. Thank you so much, Ali.
I would have needed a calculator, so I appreciate that.
All right. Our next one is questions. When median earnings show $0.00, but there is a count in the numerator. Would that be the QPR trying to say there are no positive follow-ups for that goal?

Slaughter, Alison S - ETA 1:56:42
So if there is zero in the median earnings but there is a count in the numerator that is saying that there are. I'm not sure I've seen that one happen. What we see more often is that there's zero in the rate for median earnings, but that there's no one in the count, which means that you probably have some undone follow up twos if there is a zero and there is a count. Yeah, there could be an undone number of follow-ups.
I don't know if anyone from BCT can weigh in. Otherwise, Emmanuel, if you have a specific QPR, you're looking at, that shows that, send that to Zendesk and we can take a look. But most likely yeah, if you have zero in the median earnings, it means that you need to make sure all of your follow up twos are completed on participants where you said yes, they're employed in quarter two after exit and their follow up one.

Wilson, Toni K - SCSEP 1:57:45
And we'll get that confirmed.
So as part of our FAQS, you know, if it's something that we can, if it's not necessary, specific to this, that one we can make sure the answers there. Otherwise, we'll just work with it in a manual directly. So, thank you for that question.
There is a question that was asked earlier, but as part of this section, so it's Ali, you know, possibly Ron, can you expand on how slots are determined? When there are migrations of people from urban areas to rural areas and vice versa, how does DOL account for that change in the population?

Ron Schack 1:58:31
Oh, so sure.

Wilson, Toni K - SCSEP 1:58:31
So Ron, you think you can help out with that one?

Ron Schack 1:58:34
So that's what equitable distribution is about and every four years we do a full revamping of Ed, based on the most recent census data, and essentially any migration that had would have occurred in the past four years would be captured by that update. Migrations of those kind don't tend to happen rapidly, and they're usually captured, well captured by that update every four years. Unfortunately, the Ed process isn't one that is quick or easy or flexible, which is why we only do it once every four years. In the future, we might consider trying to do it more often, but for the past 20 years it's been done every four years.

Wilson, Toni K - SCSEP 1:59:51
Alright, thank you so much, Ron.
I'd also like to underscore equitable distribution, anything with minority reports? These are all connected to the TEGL 2124, and we do not have any kind of guidance or update at this time. And as guidance comes out, we will be sure to share that, so we're giving the factual information of how these things work, but we're not providing any guidance in reference to its role as SCSEP, as it relates to that TEGL. So, I just wanted to underscore that. As always, stay in touch with your FPO, if any additional guidance comes out.
All right.
I don't know if there are questions on this section, so if those, I know there might be a few, but we're gonna save those to the end and let Ron jump in.
So, Ron, I believe you're up next or am I wrong on that?

Ron Schack 2:01:02
OK.
I'm up next.
Next slide please, so I know what I'm talking about here.

Wilson, Toni K - SCSEP 2:01:06
Yes, all right. Sorry about that.
Too many screens.
Yeah, exactly.
The drawback of not being in the room with you.

Ron Schack 2:01:12
One more.

Wilson, Toni K - SCSEP 2:01:14
All right.
Thank you so much.

Ron Schack 2:01:16
One more slide please.
OK.
So we have these kind of specialty topics around performance. They relate to performance in one way or the other. The first is equitable distribution that we've been referencing. Equitable distribution, or ED, is the obligation to serve each county in accordance with its number of modified positions. So, within each state, the distribution of authorized positions to the counties is determined by each county's percentage of the SCSEP eligible population in the state, as determined by the census. Ed is reset after each national grantee competition. So, or I'm sorry for each national grantee competition. So, ED ensures that every eligible individual in a state has an equal chance of enrolling in SCSEP. Without ED grantees would have a powerful incentive to serve predominantly areas where the host agencies and jobs are located. So, ED sort of levels the playing field.
Next slide.
So each year, grantees complete an annual report on the degree to which they have complied with ED and their service areas and there are three sections of the report. The first section is the summary of the variance data. GPMS contains quarterly equitable distribution data that tracks the number of modified positions in each county. The enrollment number, the variance, or the variance, or the difference between the modified positions in the enrollment. Once that is reported, you discuss the reasons for and the significance of the variance and a plan to improve Ed and the grant year during the program year and so I think in the future we're going to have a webinar, or a separate training session devoted to how this analysis is done. But for now, just think of it as you're looking at the modified positions in each county and your actual enrollment, and then looking at the difference. And you know, there's going to be some natural variation in that from quarter to quarter and you want to look over time to see whether there's a persistent under or over enrollment, and that's what you want to try to deal with in any improvement plan.
Next slide.

So another separate strand of analysis is the SCSEP minority report. It's an analysis of the levels of participation and the outcomes achieved by minority individuals at the nationwide and grantee levels. Volume one is actually, let's say, both participation and employment, but at the nationwide level. And volume two looks at participation and employment-based outcomes, compared by race and ethnicity at the grantee level and the national grantee by state level. So, volume two is what we distribute to the grantees for them to analyze and for them to identify if there are any significant underservice of any particular minority group at both the grantee level and the national grantee by state level. Grantees use the report data to improve services to individuals from minority populations and in the annual allotment TEGL, the state plans and funding competitions. We use the SCSEP minority report results as a way of assessing what's happening and a way to catalyze improvement in these areas.
Next slide.
So then we have the customer satisfaction survey and as I've already mentioned, a key part of the survey is that American customer satisfaction index, which is 3 questions on each of the three customer groups, employers, host agencies and participants, and that those ACSI scores are used in the grantee performance evaluation. But beyond that, there are a number of other questions in each survey that relates to the participant or host agency or employer experience and provides us more information about what is driving or affecting that customer satisfaction. So at the nationwide level we issue a report for each customer group that show aggregate results for each question on the participant and host agency surveys, the response rates and ACSI scores for each grantee and an analysis of the key drivers of the ACSI score for participants, host agencies, and once it gets started again, we also issue grantee level reports that show the results for each question on each survey for each grantee, you know, for that grantee and analysis of the key drivers of the ACSI score for participants, host agencies, and ultimately employers. And we'll also have a training session on analyzing and utilizing your customer satisfaction survey results in the future.
Next slide.
So is this mine or yours, Ali?

Slaughter, Alison S - ETA 2:07:55
I can take this Ron.

Ron Schack 2:07:56
OK.

Slaughter, Alison S - ETA 2:07:56

Thank you.
Yeah. And I just want to go back to what you said about the training on analyzing the customer SAT surveys as well. I think that's a huge part of our continuous improvement cycle, right? Is getting that data from our grantees in a survey function and being able to apply that to see ways to make your program better. So definitely a big part of that.
All right.
So you heard about what these reports are now what is your role as a grantee in completing these reports? So typically, we complete the equitable distribution report during quarter two of the year. This year looks a little different because we had a transition, and some slots got moved around because of that national competition.
So service areas changed. It's one of the reasons why we don't have goals for community service or service level this year. Another responsibility beyond completing that report is complying with equitable distribution. We know you can't serve every area exactly, as that number is for each county, but as much as possible, ensuring that you are, you know, giving every individual an equal opportunity for employment in the SCSEP program, no matter what county they live in, no matter how far from the office, any of that they are. And then based on that data, is completing an annual report that's based on the data housed in GPMS. For the minority report, our target publication date is usually around May of each year with volume to produce for use in the annual grant application process. So as Ron talked about before, we use that in applying using that data and so that we target to have it available for you to use for that allotment to you.
The National Office uses GPMS data to complete and publish the analysis and then it's your responsibility as a grant to review the report and use any conclusions to improve service delivery to minority populations. And again, you know, just like the other reports we talked about, we'll have, you know, more in depth sessions on how to analyze these reports and apply them to your program.
Next slide please.
And lastly, what is your responsibility with the customer satisfaction reports? Our target publication date, excuse me, is to make them available for the grantee performance evaluation, which usually follows 120 days after the end of a program year. So, we're trying to get those surveys out there in the field shortly after the program year ends, so that we have those responses available for the performance evaluation.

Ron Schack 2:10:49
The hope.
I'm sorry.
The hope is that for the participant and host agency survey, you know that would be normally done during the summer months, right?

Slaughter, Alison S - ETA 2:10:59
Got it. OK.

Ron Schack 2:10:59
We would draw the sample late in the program year and we would do the survey during the summer months and then that would allow us to have enough time to compile the results so that we would have the a SCSEP course for the grantee performance evaluation.

Slaughter, Alison S - ETA 2:11:16
Thanks Ron for clarifying that.
So in the summer, to have the survey on the field and then have it available, the report, the actual report comes a little later in the fall after they've had the chance to, you know, analyze all the data. Your responsibility includes, you probably got a lot of emails recently, cleaning data in GPMS for the entities in the sample population, so making sure that addresses, e-mail addresses, phone numbers, all of that is correct in the system so that we have accurate information to try and get as many responses back as we can. And then same thing, making sure you're reviewing your report and using those conclusions to improve your service delivery to all three of those populations, participants, host agencies and employers.
All right.
And with that, I think our next slide is Q&A, unless you had anything else to add, Ron.

Ron Schack 2:12:09
Nope, I'm. I'm good for now.

Wilson, Toni K - SCSEP 2:12:12
Alright you guys.
Thank you so much.
So before we move into any additional Q&A, this is a reminder if you have any questions or answers, we've come towards the end of our presentation. So, this is a good chance to put any of those in the chat. We'll be sure to address them. I also wanted to just highlight something. I know this is a lot of detailed information, so we wanted to spend the day with kind of walking through. I know a lot of this is, believe it or not, on a more higher level trying to get into the weeds, so we will also be following up on some of these pieces through what we call a webcast, which will be a recording where we walk through each of these steps, and we'll share that. So that is something that both

yourselves or as you want to share with staff or subcontractors, those that need a little more. Just very, very much more into the details. We'll be providing that. So just wanted to note that. And as always, you have access to this recording to share. So, let's see what questions that we have for Ron and Ali.
So, Ali, I'm gonna start out with you in reference to data validation. There is a question on, is data validation no longer required?

Slaughter, Alison S - ETA 2:13:41
Our next section will be all about data validation, so we will get to that shortly after this.

Wilson, Toni K - SCSEP 2:13:46
All right.
Sounds good.
I will hold off on that.
My apologies for not catching that piece. Let's see.
Alright, Ron, you mentioned that one provider did not make the 80% of the adjusted performance measures for PY 23. I was wondering where that information is available or stored so we can review it. Please advise.
I don't know if you had that.

Ron Schack 2:14:10
Yeah. So, I think that was.
That was a fact. That was.

Slaughter, Alison S - ETA 2:14:17
21.

Ron Schack 2:14:19
I'm sorry, the 20. I'm sorry.

Slaughter, Alison S - ETA 2:14:21
I think that was maybe referencing PY 21. Yeah, yep.

Ron Schack 2:14:24
Yeah, I think that was from a prior program year. So that was sort of a stray thing, but we are currently doing or conducting the grantee performance evaluation, and it should be out soon. And when it comes out, of course every grantee will get it and you'll be able to see your performance on all the measures as well as everybody else's performance on

all the measures.
So that's coming soon.
But it's not ready quite yet.

Wilson, Toni K - SCSEP 2:14:59
Alright.

Ron Schack 2:14:59
And that's primarily because we're waiting for the results of the customer surveys that are still on the field at the moment.

Wilson, Toni K - SCSEP 2:15:10
Thank you, Ron.
Alright. Another question that we have is our agency received a high number of returned customer service customer stats surveys, and I've updated the spreadsheet as they were returned. How can I verify that they were sent back out?

Ron Schack 2:15:31
You could send that list to me or to Barry Goff, my business partner, and we will check with the Mail House to make sure that they were resent.

Wilson, Toni K - SCSEP 2:15:46
Michi, looks like you have some more to add, so if you don't mind jumping in there.
Thank you. Thank you.

McNeace, Meche - ETA CTR 2:15:47
Can I jump?

Ron Schack 2:15:49
Oh, sure.

McNeace, Meche - ETA CTR 2:15:49
Can I jump in here if this is related to, yeah, you're welcome. If this is related to participant surveys. So, we have instructions out there in the field that we go through, wave one and two and three.

Wilson, Toni K - SCSEP 2:15:51
Welcome back Michi.

McNeace, Meche - ETA CTR 2:16:03
So what we have sent out is that if they have any bad addresses, which means if they have participant surveys that have been returned because of the address is no longer valid, that we asked them to fill out the bad address template. It's an excel sheet and e-mail that back. I'm sorry Ron. Not to Ron or Barry, but to SCSEPtechnicalassistance@dol.gov.

Ron Schack 2:16:26
That's even better. I like that better.

Wilson, Toni K - SCSEP 2:16:28
Ron, you're about to get a whole mailbox full of emails, so let's make sure we.

McNeace, Meche - ETA CTR 2:16:33
Yeah. Yeah, yeah, yeah. We're.

Wilson, Toni K - SCSEP 2:16:36
And plus it just allows us to make sure that we like documented what we have and stuff. So please send that.
That and Michi of.

McNeace, Meche - ETA CTR 2:16:40
Because to ensure we follow our process and so with that being said, I want to remind everybody, the timeline to return for wave 2 bad addresses has come and gone. There is a wave 3, so if there are anybody who still feels that they have returned bad addresses and if they haven't sent that in, get that into us ASAP so we can send it in so that we hope that it'll make it in the final wave 3. That'll be the next batch of surveys that'll go back out with the new addresses, so again I said if there are those that are still out there and they haven't returned them, please get them into us as soon as you can.

Wilson, Toni K - SCSEP 2:17:22
Thank you so much, Michi. If you don't mind putting that e-mail address that they can send them, for everybody to have that. To put that in the chat.

McNeace, Meche - ETA CTR 2:17:28
I sure will.

Wilson, Toni K - SCSEP 2:17:30
Appreciate that.
All right.
I think we'll go to our last question and then we'll move forward. The suggested ones for you Ali. The suggestion is to use information around Ed to improve. What do you do if it is beyond the scope of SCSEP, so an example would be. There is no transportation in the region, sites in the county or nearby counties, there's an inability to identify participants even when working with partner agencies.

Slaughter, Alison S - ETA 2:18:02
That's a great question.
And if other folks want to chime in as well, I'll start with. If you are working to determine whether those might be factors, we have some ways to do that.
So Ron mentioned the participant customer service satisfaction survey.
There are sections in there about transportation and seeing if you're participant, if that's something that they struggle with, or if that's something that they found that you know your program was able to help them with. So being able to identify that agency and that server that that they complete the results of those surveys can help you determine if that's an issue in your area that needs to be addressed. If you know that that's an area that needs to be addressed already, there are certainly, you know, ways that your FPO can help discussing that. We are looking to do a series of peer-to-peer sessions so learning from other grantees that might have similar issues and how they've been able to address that and then we also have our wonderful technical assistance team that can help out with some of those issues. Every area is different.
You as a grantee know your service area best, but we have tools and resources to be able to help you, you know, work through some of those issues and see how we can better serve your participants.
Is there anything else that you want to add?

Wilson, Toni K - SCSEP 2:19:28
I was just gonna underscore, that is also a good piece for us for a peer-to-peer. So not that it would just be on that, but part of the peer-to-peer. I think this is also some good discussion. So, I flagged that as another one of those in that area.
Ron, did you have something you wanted to add?

Ron Schack 2:19:45
No, I was just agreeing that this would be. Yeah, this.

Wilson, Toni K - SCSEP 2:19:45
OK.
I just suddenly jumped up.
I just was checking.

Ron Schack 2:19:48
Yeah, this would be a good thing to share, you know. There I think we have to acknowledge that when you get to counties that have very small numbers of positions and especially if they're outlying counties, they present real challenges, and it takes some creative thinking to find ways of maintaining a sustained enrollment level in those counties. So that it'll be important to talk to our peers and to brainstorm together about that stuff.

Wilson, Toni K - SCSEP 2:20:26
Well I've added it to list, so we'll make sure that that's one of the ones that we include. Before we move to the next session, this one I did, Michi you, these other two are kind of clarifying what you said, so I don't get too far away from it. When you were talking about the customer stat surveys, there's a follow up on how do you verify if that happened, Michi? And when is wave 3?

McNeace, Meche - ETA CTR 2:20:54
OK, I guess.

Wilson, Toni K - SCSEP 2:20:55
So I'm assuming you're saying verify bad addresses.
I'm sorry. I was just reading the question, but I'm assuming they were talking about the bad addresses. If it's something different, please put that in the chat.
All right, back to you, Michi.

McNeace, Meche - ETA CTR 2:21:07
Two things Toni, is if you're asking, how do you verify? If you have sent in any bad addresses, we can do that. We can go and check and see if we have an e-mail from your grantee so we can go ahead and do that offline and send you an e-mail to let you know we do have one or we did not get one and so and then the answer to the second question about wave three. Wave 2 is scheduled to go out by the 31st of this month and then wave three will go out about two to three weeks after that. So that's why we're saying if you have any bad addresses that you need to get sent in, I think wave 2 is going

to be a little bit too late. I understand that. I believe that that's correct to get any bad address in for wave 2, but we can get it in for wave 3 if you get it to us as soon as possible.
I hope I answered the questions.

Wilson, Toni K - SCSEP 2:22:07
If not, please put that back in the chat of just whatever your follow up and we'll make sure that we answer that before we close out.
It sounds like we're good, though.
But if not, let us know.
All right.
Let's move on to our next slide.
All right. We are down to the final stretch, part five data validation. Am I handing this over to you, Ali, or you and Ron?

Slaughter, Alison S - ETA 2:22:36
Yes. Thanks Toni.

Wilson, Toni K - SCSEP 2:22:37
All right, there you go.

Slaughter, Alison S - ETA 2:22:38
I will take it from here.
So next slide please.
Our last section is going to be talking about data validation. I know there's been a lot of questions recently about what's going to be happening with data validation in our new system. And before we get to that, I just want to talk in general about the concept of data validation and what we like to call the data validation framework.
I think we often can focus in on just one aspect of data validation, which is verifying documents that support eligibility, which is a very important part of the framework, but there are others as well. So, in general, data validation can also include timely and comprehensive documentation of data into the case management system or GPMS, making sure that you have, you know, data entered timely when it is top of mind, whether it's a new service that was added and you have all those details ready, that is part of the data validation framework. Another part of the data validation framework is the validations that have been built into GPMS and these include things like data type checks, range checks and unique values. A few examples of this would be, for example, right, you get an error if it's not a unique Social Security number. The system would tell

you that that participant is already in a system, and you have to create a new case versus creating a new participant. Another example of this would be like a data type check, making sure that the date of birth field has to be a date.
It can't be letters. It has to be an actual date and then you know you've seen all those error messages that will pop up if you have overlapping dates for like an assignment and a break. Those checks are in the system so that we don't have to go back and clean up data later. We're able to catch any of these things that might be mistakes and have them be correct in the system. Of course, like I mentioned, documentation verification is an important part of data validation. It supports the eligibility of a participant and also the services that they have received. Examples of this would be, you know, having a birth certificate to support an individual's date of birth, or a payroll record to support hours that were paid for community service assignment. And then the last part of our framework is periodic case review of eligibility, performance, outcomes and documentation. So beyond ensuring that they're there, the documents or the data, making sure that you go back and review data and if you're identifying any issues, how you address those with your staff, whether through training or additional review of participants. So that is our framework. I think we have been talking about this a bit at our last few all grantee calls.
Next slide please.
In PY25, SCSEP will be joining ETA data validation, joint ETA data validation TEGL 2319 guidance for validating required performance data submitted by grant recipients of the United States Department of Labor Workforce Programs. So, if you are a state grantee, this TEGL is probably pretty familiar to you, and I have it up here in my computer. I'm just gonna drop the link in the chat. So, WIOA follows this TEGL, other discretionary programs follow this TEGL and we will be joining in on this and the purpose of validation procedures that are documented in this TEGL are the following on the screen and as you'll notice, they correspond very closely to what we talked about on the last slide about that framework, so it's you know about verifying performance data reported by grantees is valid, accurate, reliable and comparable.
Identifying anomalies through a periodic review and then resolving those issues.
Having select source documentation to verify common data elements and then improving performance accountability. We will have a whole roll out for this transition into the joint data validation TEGL, so there will be lots more to come on this, but we wanted to give a bit more of a preview during our call today before we roll it out. So, we'll talk about next steps.
But first, if we can go to the next slide.
We'll just look at some of the roles involved in this TEGL as we've been talking throughout this entire presentation about what's the grantee’s role and what are some

of the roles of DOL. So, these are all laid out in the TEGL, if you'd like to review them for yourself. But some of the things under the grantees role include developing written procedures for conducting data validation, making sure you train your staff on the policy that you've created, and then implementing that TEGL, completing regular data integrity reviews, so taking a select number of cases, going through a complete data validation review and making sure everything looks as expected, the TEGL recommends quarterly. If there are any missing documents or erroneous data that you found during your review, identifying that and then correcting it and then in the spirit of continuous improvement, you know, occasionally assessing your policies and your procedures and making sure if you need to, you can make any adjustments as necessary. On the DOL side, our role within this joint data validation TEGL is to provide quarterly feedback to grant recipients regarding performance report. So just like we hope to provide additional materials on how you can analyze your QPR, you know DOL, and the program office will also be involved in providing frequent you know analyzing the QPR itself and coming back and saying hey, we're seeing this trend across many grantees. Let's discuss why we think this might be happening in ways that we can prevent this from happening in the future. Along with that is also providing technical assistance within the framework of data validation and helping review any data validation policies and then conducting monitoring, which your FPO is already doing. So, none of this is changing. It's just written specifically in the TEGL. During that monitoring, it can include things such as checking that you have that data validation policy on hand and verifying your compliance with it, and then reviewing files from the grantees, monitoring and making sure that any issues were then corrected. And then our role in the program office is also to maintain the source document guide. We'll talk about this in a second, but it looks really similar to what you may be used to in the data validation handbook that we currently have for SCSEP.

It's an attachment two, I want to say of the TEGL. You'll just see every program that's listed there. That so again, if you're a state that operates WIOA, you can see those source documentations there. So SCSEP will be added to that, and you'll see that list of documentation there. So, we recognize that this will be a change for everyone. We will, moving forward, we won't have the, if you were familiar with the legacy system SPARQ, we won't have that data validation form in the system anymore. That validation and reviewing case files will be done outside of the system. Grantees will, you know, they have access to their list of participants, will be able to pull that list and identify participants that they will be case files that they will be reviewing and monitoring so that will be a change in the system. But otherwise again, that framework and the concept of data validation has not changed.

So let's go to the next slide and we'll talk about some next steps.
We expect that there will be a change three to the TEGL, that I put in the chat.
We can only provide an estimated time frame, but the latest we've heard is summer of 2025, so we hope to have that just around the start of the program year and SCSEP will be added in the specific instructions and also in that attachment to where it lists all the documents that can be used to validate. There'll be a SCSEP specific column that will be there for all of our SCSEP specific elements. Like I said, this will be a big roll out, so there will be lots more guidance and training provided on this. Things such as policies reviewing, again grantee responsibilities under the TEGL and then reviewing the source documentation guidance. Until then, the data collection handbook that we have available for SCSEP grantees. Mainly this the approved list of documents that you can use to verify, is your go to guide for anything data validation. There's a lot of information in that handbook about what was in the legacy system around that form and how samples are pulled. For now, focus on that list of approved documentation for verifying case files and then we will transition to this TEGL, and you'll have all the information you need to be able to implement this, TEGL. OK. I think we're gonna roll on through our next section, which is resources and then we'll have one final Q&A at the end.
So, with that, if you could move to the next slide.
So Kevin gave a great demonstration yesterday on our Community of Practice. That is where a lot of these performance resources are housed and where we hope to continue to add more resources. There's a couple different performance pages that I'll point out. They're all linked here, so when you have a copy of the PowerPoint, you should be able to click on them. We have a performance hub. It not only has like resources, but it also has historical performance. So, you can access PY 22 grantee performance evaluations, the survey results from PY 21. That's all available on the performance hub. We did just create a specific hub for WIPS. That's that second one listed there. So, if you're in that world of reporting WIPS and learning that right now, there's a hub specific for that. And then I've linked to things that are on the Community of Practice. They're actually on the GPMS page. It's the data collection handbook and the GPMS handbook. And then if you're also looking for other historical performance of the performance page on the DOL ETA SCSEP website has all of our records of publicly available performance data, so you can look back at nationwide QPRs grantee performance evaluations, minority reports and then customer satisfaction survey results. All those are available on our ETA website.
All right. With that, let's move on to our last slide and then we'll go to Q&A.
We've been teasing this throughout the whole 3 days, so just a couple of things I'll emphasize. We still have our vLive that's being offered twice monthly currently to continue supporting all levels of GPMS users. So, they're not just for grantee admins,

they're not just for you know, the grantee admin contact, they're for case managers read only roles, case manager, supervisors. All roles are invited, and we encourage them to attend to hear from their peers and get support on that. And we plan to have that updated GPMS training coming very soon. On the performance side of things, again, your FPO is always your first line of contact. They know how to get a hold of Ron and myself if there are any performance questions, and they need to pull us in. So always reach out to your FPO for any of those questions. And then, you know, like I've been saying, we plan to publish some web casts that go more in depth in each of these topics. So having one specifically on you know grantee performance evaluation and what that looks like that you can use for yourself and also to train other staff in your organization. All right. With that, I will pass it back one more time to Toni for our last set of questions.

Wilson, Toni K - SCSEP 2:35:14
Alright, thank you so much, Ali.
Appreciate you guys.
Alright, so a Q&A. This is the last set of Q&A, so if you have any questions, this is your last chance to put those in the chat. And as I said, we'll be doing a roll up of all of the FAQs and that will be shared on the resource hub.
We do have.
I only see like one or two one is in reference to data validation. I know you just went over, but just want to acknowledge the question and data no longer required. As you said, that is the case. I did want to just add to that, that all of our ETA programs that dated the way it's being moved the way Ali described it. They're all doing it that way, so part of it is to align with all of our other ETA programs. But we will, as you said, still be using that as a resource. The data validation handbook as a resource will have TA, technical assistance and all other supports that can be used, but I just wanted to flag that that was part of the behind the scenes on why the change.
Let's see, there's a question here for I'm going to hand this one over to Ali.
When does the quarterly ED data in GPMS close? Or does it close automatically at the end of each quarter?

Slaughter, Alison S - ETA 2:36:45
Great question and thanks for your patience, Julian.
We were trying to make sure we had the correct answer before we answered that.
So the ED report is not like the QPRs, where we like freeze the data and there's no longer changes. So, enrollments are updated daily for the equitable distribution report, so those should be reflected. I believe they're part of like the nightly refresh that

happens a couple parts of the system overnight. And the clocks change at 12:01. A bunch of things are updated, and I believe that's one of those updated items. So, you should be able to use those ED reports to track your enrollment in live real time.
The authorized positions and the modified positions, we update those quarterly. So that is part of and often they're not changing. So, for a program year, if there's no changes, those might stay the same. But for example, with this current program here, as we've been going through a transition and we've seen slots change hands, we've been adding new files every time those changes happen and that is to reflect a quarterly difference. So, you may see an AP or an MP change between quarter one and quarter two of your ED reports. So those are quarterly, and the enrollments are daily.

Wilson, Toni K - SCSEP 2:38:11
Right. Our next question is around forms.
Will there be forms for GPMS like there was in SPARQ?
Ali, you want to get started on that, OK?

Slaughter, Alison S - ETA 2:38:22
There sure will be.
I know these are highly anticipated. We have been working on them just to make sure that they are reflecting of any of the differences between GPMS and the legacy system SPARQ. They are going through the approval process. We hope to have them available for you soon. So, we will keep you updated when those are available. And just to clarify for those that may not be familiar with the legacy site, these were forms that mirrored the questions the intake part of GPMS for eligibility, characteristics, all of that. So that you could complete it with a participant.

Slaughter, Alison S - ETA 2:38:57
Offline and then be able to input that into the system. So, we currently don't have those updated forms yet to reflect GPMS, but that's what we're working on.
Wilson, Toni K - SCSEP 2:39:08
Thank you so much, Ali.
I believe that we've answered all of at least the performance related ones. I don't see any others in the chat. There's two questions outside of that, which I'll get to in a second. Just making sure I'm not missing any others. All right, so. One other. So, two other questions which I can answer is around yesterday, in red, as we were talking about grievance procedures. There was a question around the SCSEP grievance procedure requirements list. Other addresses after the correct address. Could you verify if those should be removed? I'll read that question over time. The SCSEP

grievance procedure requirements, list other addresses after the correct address. Could you verify if those should be removed, and the answer is these addresses that are used in the PowerPoint are in the addresses that should be used as they are the most current. So, we had a slide which is now on the resource hub and those addresses are the most current ones. So those are the ones that should be used. Just want to make sure. It sounded like it was a little confusing on that yesterday, so we're just clarifying that one. And then a second part to clarify, contacting the DOL division about a grievance is not to escalate the grievance, it is to review how the grantee followed the grievance policy, correct? That is correct. You need to clarify that grievance has a right to appeal to the DOL DNPTTA. Once a final determination has been issued by the grantee and that you don't agree, they can grieve to CRC if the alleged discrimination is involved and that will be in the FAQs. So that you know sometimes it's hard when somebody's reading a question and answer, so that will also be in the FAQs of that question with the answer. If you need some follow up on that please, I encourage you to reach out to your FPO. One last look, and I don't see any more questions, so I'm going to stop there.

All right, so first let me just say thank you so much, Ali and Ron for a day of performance and GPMS and all of our reporting requirements. This is really good stuff. I know there's a lot of information. We'll look forward to the webcast and as I said, I flagged a few things that we can make sure we do in a peer-to-peer. So, I appreciate all the hard work that you, Ali, have done on this. You, Ron, as I said, you're a performance genius and you don't necessary get to see their faces, but the behind the scenes we have BCT, which is the contractor, that has been working day and night to make sure that this system is stabilized. And all of your questions and things they've been responding and then also to the TwoTech team. Michi and Joyce and Lauren and Bradley and Kevin and Jada and the gang. They've spent hours in reference to making sure the vLive are in entertaining, but at the same time that you're learning, so I want to just give a shout out. Thank you so much for all of the behind the scenes works. I apologize if I've left anybody out, but it is definitely a collective and please know that all have been working really hard to make sure that we have something that everyone could use. So just wanted to flag that. So, we're going to be wrapping up. We had about. I was hoping at least as I said, we'd be ending by 4, so we're close to that, just a few more minutes. Hopefully everyone was able to get a takeaway. It's always good if you can get at least three takeaways from any type of training or conference, so hopefully that is the case for you. As a wrap up, we will be posting everything on the resource hub. We'll send out an e-mail with these links. So, you have that for yourself and your teams and your sub recipients in reference to any guidance, please make sure that you stay in touch with the FPO. And as anything comes about, we'll be sure to share that information and we'll

be gathering together from the comments, some future peer to peers. We plan to roll out these web casts in peer to peers from spring going forward. And hopefully one of those can be an in person, or if not more, but we'll keep you posted on that option and then in the meantime, hopefully travel will be part of what we can do in the future, and I look forward to getting to meet everyone in person. I would love to be able to see your programs in person, so hopefully we can get those things on the schedule. So, with that said, thank you to you. Thank you for all the work that you do.
It's great work for our participants and we're just happy to be able to be part of that. So, thanks everyone.
Thanks to the team and we will see you at our next all grantee call.
Have a good one, everyone.
Thank you.

Bronson, Bradley K - ETA CTR stopped transcription