Table 1-1 Unemployment Insurance Eligibility, by Type of Determination and Outcome, United States, fiscal year 1998 (figures in thousands)

Monetary Determinations

Initial and transitional claims	10,606
Sufficient wage credits	9,401
Insufficient wage credits	1,204
Proportion with insufficient wage credits	0.114

Separation Determinations

Initial and reopened claims	15,470
No Issue	12,063
Issue/adjudicated	3,407
Approved	1,550
Denied	1,857
Proportion of initial and reopened claims adjudicated	0.220
Proportion of adjudicated claims denied	0.545
Proportion of initial and reopened claims denied	0.120

Nonseparations Determinations

Total claimant contacts	131,614
Week paid/no issue	127,282
Issue/adjudicated	4,332
Approved	1,969
Denied	2,363
Proportion of claimant contacts adjudicated	0.033
Proportion of adjudicated contacts denied	0.545
Proportion of claimant contacts denied	0.018

Sources: ETA 218 (monetary determinations); ETA 207 (separation and nonseparation determinations).

Table 1-5 Summary of Denial Case Error Rates by Type, 1987 Denials Pilot Project (percentage erroneous denials)

Type of Denial	Before Appeal or Redetermination (%) Average 5-State Range			r Appeal or rmination (%) 5-State Range
Monetary	23	10-36	16	7-33
Separation	15	5-29	9	2-25
Nonseparation	14	7-23	11	6-21

Source: Belle and Casey 1988, Table 3.

Table 1-6
Erroneous Denials for which Agency Was Responsible, by Type, 1987 Denials Pilot Project (percentage of errors for which agency was responsible)

Type of Denial	Average (%)	5-State Range (%)
Monetary	27	20-33
Separation	73	47-100
Nonseparation	71	48-93

Source: Belle and Casey 1988, Tables J.1 - J.5.

Table 1-7 Agency Actions in Erroneous Denials, by Type, 1987 Denials Pilot Project (percentage of erroneous denials for which each action taken, 5-state average with 5-state range in parentheses)

	Type of Denial		
Agency Action	Monetary Average (range)	Separation Average (range)	Nonseparation Average (range)
Issue undetectable with existing procedures	25 (12-43)	22 (0-54)	28 (0-62)
Already resolving	55 (29-82)	31 (17-41)	23 (8-33)
Took wrong action	4 (0-10)	32 (22-53)	29 (15-61)
Insuffficient follow-through	10 (0-27)	7 (0-14)	12 (0-47)
Issue not detected – procedures not used	6 (0-16)	7 (3-12)	9 (5-15)

Source: Belle and Casey 1988, Table 4.

Table 2-1 General Characteristics of States Participating in the DCA Pilot Project, 1997

			State		
Characteristic	<u>Nebraska</u>	New Jersey	South Carolina	West Virginia	Wisconsin
Population (thousands)	1,665	8,053	3,760	1,816	5,170
Labor force (thousands)	906	4,194	1,913	805	2,928
Percentage growth (1990-97)	5.0%	3.9%	7.9%	1.2%	5.7%
Land area (square miles)	76,878	7,491	30,111	24,087	54,314
Population per square mile	21.3	1,070.9	122.0	75.9	94.3
Average annual pay	\$23,291	\$35,928	\$24,093	\$24,075	\$26,021
Unemployment rate	2.6%	5.1%	4.5%	6.9%	3.7%

Sources: U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics and Statistical Abstract of the United States. Notes: The unemployment rate in 1997 for the United States was 4.9%. The U.S. population grew by 7.6% between 1990 and 1997).

Table 2-2 UI Eligibility Criteria in States Participating in the DCA Pilot Project, 1997

			State		
Eligibility Criteria	Nebraska	New Jersey	South Carolina	West Virginia	Wisconsin
Monetary					
Formula	Flat	20 weeks	1.5 x HQ	Flat	30 x WBA
Minimum earnings	\$1,200	\$2,020	\$900	\$2,200	\$1,590
Distribution	≥\$400	2Q	2Q	2Q	8 x WBA
	utside HQ		-~	200	outside HQ
Seasonal					00.10.00
restriction	no	no	no	yes	yes
				·	·
Separation					
Voluntary leaving:					
Good cause restric	ted				
to work-related is		yes	no	yes	yes
Number of inclusion		0	0	2	4
Disqualification	7-10	Duration	Duration	Duration	Duration
period	weeks				
Earnings to					
requalify		6 WBA	8 WBA	30 days	4 WBA
, ,				•	
Misconduct:					
Disqualification					
period (weeks)	7-10	5	5-26	6	7
Earnings to					
requalify					14 x WBA
Benefits reduced	yes	no	yes	yes	yes
Added penalty					
for gross miscond	duct yes	yes	yes	yes	no
Nonseparation					
Able and available fo	, p.				
Any work		VOC	no	no	V00
Suitable work	yes no	yes no	no	no	yes no
Usual work	no	no	yes	yes	no
OSuai Work	110	110	yes	ycs	110
Refusing suitable wo	rk:				
Disqualification	7-10	3	Duration	4	Duration
period	weeks	weeks		weeks	
Benefits reduced	yes	no	no	yes	no

Note: See section 2.3 for discussion.

Sources: U.S. Department of Labor, <u>Comparison of State Unemployment Insurance Laws</u> (1997); Advisory Council on Unemployment Insurance (1995, Chapters 7 and 8), Nicholson (1997), Anderson (1997), and the laws of each of the five pilot states.

Table 3-1
Informal or "Counter" Monetary Denials and Formal Monetary Denials of
Unemployment Insurance Benefits, West Virginia, by Week, April and May 1998

Week Ending	Counter Denials	Formal Monetary Denials
April 4	61	45
April 10	105	107
April 17	103	67
April 24	92	60
May 1	62	55
May 8	82	54
May 15	75	51
May 12	83	55
May 29	89	57
Nine-week Total	752	551

Source: West Virgina Bureau of Employment Programs.

Table 4-1
Denial Case Error Rates by State and Type
(percentage erroneous denials with frequencies in parentheses)

		Denial Type			
State	<u>Monetary</u>	<u>Separation</u>	<u>Nonseparation</u>		
Nebraska	10.1	4.0	14.0		
	(20/198)	(8/200)	(28/200)		
New Jersey	12.6	11.3	14.4		
	(23/182)	(22/195)	(28/195)		
South Carolina	23.4	5.0	18.5		
	(45/192)	(10/200)	(37/200)		
West Virginia	15.1	3.4	6.8		
	(19/126)	(7/208)	(14/206)		
Wisconsin	18.2	19.7	21.7		
	(37/203)	(40/203)	(44/203)		
All Five Pilot States	16.0	8.7	15.0		
	(144/901)	(87/1,006)	(151/1,004)		

Table 4-2 Accuracy of Monetary Denials, by State and Reason for Denial (frequencies with row percentages in parentheses)

A. All five pilot states

	Accuracy of denial			
Reason	<u>improper</u>	proper	Total	
Sufficient wages/hours/weeks/days	0 (0)	3 (100)	3 (100)	
Insufficient wages	98 (14)	585 (68)	683 (100)	
Insufficient hours/weeks/days	1 (100)	0 (0)	1 (100)	
Failure of high quarter wage test	26 (17)	125 (83)	151 (100)	
Failed transitional work requirement	12 (27)	32 (73)	44 (100)	
Other	7 (37)	12 (63)	19 (100)	
Total	144 (16)	757 (84)	901 (100)	

B. Nebraska

	Accuracy of acrital		
Reason	improper	proper	Total
Insufficient wages	19 (10)	173 (90)	192 (100)
Insufficient hours/weeks/days	1 (100)	0 (0)	1 (100)
Other	0 (0)	5 (100)	5 (100)
Total	20 (10)	178 (90)	198 (100)

Accuracy of denial

C. New Jersey

,	Accuracy of denial			
Reason	improper	proper	Total	
Sufficient wages/hours/weeks/days	0 (0)	2 (100)	2 (100)	
Insufficient wages	21 (12)	154 (88)	175 (100)	
Failed transitional work requirement	0 (0)	2 (100)	2 (100)	
Other	2 (67)	1 (33)	3 (100)	
Total	23 (13)	159 (87)	182 (100)	

D. South Carolina

	Accuracy of denial improper proper Total		
Reason			
Insufficient wages	22 (22)	78 (78)	100 (100)
Failure of high quarter wage test	22 (25)	66 (75)	88 (100)
Failed transitional work requirement	0 (0)	1 (100)	1 (100)
Other	1 (33)	2 (67)	3 (100)
Total	45 (23)	147 (77)	192 (100)

Table 4-2 (continued)
Accuracy of Monetary Denials, by State and Reason for Denial
(frequencies with row percentages in parentheses)

E. West Virginia

L. West Virginia			
_	Accuracy of denial		
Reason	improper	proper	Total
Sufficient wages/hours/weeks/days	0 (0)	1 (100)	1 (100)
Insufficient wages	19 (18)	89 (82)	108 (100)
Failure of high quarter wage test	0 (0)	1 (100)	1 (100)
Failed transitional work requirement	0 (0)	15 (100)	15 (100)
Other	0 (0)	1 (100)	1 (100)
Total	19 (15)	107 (85)	126 (100)

F. Wisconsin

	Accuracy of denial		
Reason	improper	proper	Total
Insufficient wages	17 (16)	91 (84)	108 (100)
Failure of high quarter wage test	4 (6)	58 (94)	62 (100)
Failed transitional work requirement	12 (46)	14 (54)	26 (100)
Other	4 (57)	3 (43)	7 (100)
Total	37 (18)	166 (82)	203 (100)

Source: Tabulated from Denied Claims Accuracy Pilot records for September 1997 through September 1998.

Table 4-3 Accuracy of Separation Denials, by State and Reason for Denial (frequencies with row percentages in parentheses)

A.	ΑII	five	pilot	states
----	-----	------	-------	--------

A. All five pilot states			
	Accuracy of denial		
Reason	<u>improper</u>	proper	Total
No separation issue	1 (100)	0 (00)	1 (100)
Lack of work	1 (33)	2 (67)	3 (100)
Voluntary quit	56 (9)	548 (91)	604 (100)
Discharge	26 (7)	362 (93)	388 (100)
Not separated (e.g., job attached,			
leave of absence)	3 (30)	7 (70)	10 (100)
Total	87 (9)	919 (91)	1006 (100)
B. Nebraska			
	Accuracy	y of denial	
Reason	<u>improper</u>	<u>proper</u>	Total
Lack of work	0 (0)	2 (100)	2 (100)
Voluntary quit	7 (5)	143 (95)	150 (100)
Discharge	1 (2)	47 (98)	48 (100)
Total	8 (4)	192 (96)	200 (100)
C. New Jersey			
	Accuracy	y of denial	
Reason	<u>improper</u>	proper	Total
No separation issue	1 (100)	0 (00)	1 (100)
Lack of work	1 (100)	0 (00)	1 (100)
Voluntary quit	12 (11)	100 (89)	112 (100)
Discharge	7 (9)	69 (91)	76 (100)
Not separated (e.g., job attached,			- (()
leave of absence)	1 (20)	4 (80)	5 (100)
Total	22 (1)	173 (89)	195 (100)
D. South Carolina			
_		y of denial	
Reason	improper	proper	<u>Total</u>
Voluntary quit	5 (6)	77 (94)	82 (100)
Discharge	5 (4)	113 (96)	118 (100)
Total	10 (5)	190 (95)	200 (100)
E. West Virginia			
_		y of denial	
Reason	<u>improper</u>	<u>proper</u>	Total
Voluntary quit	4 (3)	119 (97)	123 (100)
Discharge	3 (4)	82 (96)	85 (100)
Total	7 (3)	201 (97)	208 (100)

Table 4-3 (continued)
Accuracy of Separation Denials, by State and Reason for Denial (frequencies with row percentages in parentheses)

F. Wisconsin

F. WISCONSIN				
	Accuracy of denial			
Reason	<u>improper</u>	<u>proper</u>	Total	
Voluntary quit	28 (20)	109 (80)	137 (100)	
Discharge	10 (16)	51 (84)	61 (100)	
Not separated (e.g., job attached,				
leave of absence)	2 (40)	3 (60)	5 (100)	
Total	40 (20)	163 (80)	203 (100)	

Source: Tabulated from Denied Claims Accuracy Pilot records for September 1997 through September 1998.

Table 4-4
Accuracy of Nonseparation Denials by State and Reason for Denial (frequencies with row percentages in parentheses)

A. All five pilot states

	Accuracy	/ of denial	
Reason	<u>improper</u>	<u>proper</u>	Total
No nonseparation issue	0 (0)	2 (100)	2 (100)
Able issue	12 (10)	108 (90)	120 (100)
Available issue	37 (16)	199 (84)	236 (100)
Work search issue	7 (10)	64 (90)	71 (100)
Disqualifying/unreported income	46 (25)	139 (75)	185 (100)
Refusal of work	3 (17)	15 (83)	18 (100)
Reporting/registration violation	36 (12)	263 (88)	299 (100)
Other	10 (14)	63 (86)	73 (100)
Total	151 (15)	853 (85)	1004 (100)

B. Nebraska

Billobiacita				
	Accuracy of denial			
Reason	improper	<u>proper</u>	Total	
No nonseparation issue	0 (0)	2 (100)	2 (100)	
Able issue	1 (9)	10 (91)	11 (100)	
Available issue	2 (13)	13 (87)	15 (100)	
Work search issue	0 (0)	10 (100)	10 (100)	
Disqualifying/unreported income	18 (27)	47 (72)	65 (100)	
Reporting/registration violation	5 (6)	78 (94)	83 (100)	
Other	2 (14)	12 (86)	14 (100)	
Total	28 (14)	172 (86)	200 (100)	

C. New Jersey

	Accuracy	of denial	
Reason	<u>improper</u>	_proper_	Total
Able issue	2 (6)	29 (94)	31 (100)
Available issue	9 (12)	65 (88)	74 (100)
Work search issue	0 (0)	5 (100)	5 (100)
Disqualifying/unreported income	1 (100)	0 (0)	1 (100)
Refusal of work	0 (0)	2 (100)	2 (100)
Reporting/registration violation	14 (19)	61 (81)	75 (100)
Other	2 (29)	5 (71)	7 (100)
Total	28 (14)	167 (86)	195 (100)

Table 4-4 (continued)
Accuracy of Nonseparation Denials by State and Reason for Denial
(frequencies with row percentages in parentheses)

D. South Carolina

	Accuracy	of denial	
Reason	<u>improper</u>	proper	Total
Able issue	4 (9)	40 (91)	42 (100)
Available issue	4 (11)	33 (89)	37 (100)
Work search issue	5 (17)	24 (83)	29 (100)
Disqualifying/unreported income	15 (36)	27 (64)	42 (100)
Refusal of work	1 (20)	4 (80)	5 (100)
Reporting/registration violation	6 (16)	31 (84)	37 (100)
Other	2 (33)	4 (67)	6 (100)
Total	37 (19)	163 (82)	200 (100)

E. West Virginia

	Accuracy	<u>or deniai</u>	
Reason	improper	proper	Total
Able issue	1 (6)	17 (94)	18 (100)
Available issue	3 (5)	53 (95)	56 (100)
Work search issue	1 (8)	11 (92)	12 (100)
Disqualifying/unreported income	2 (6)	30 (94)	32 (100)
Refusal of work	1 (11)	8 (89)	9 (100)
Reporting/registration violation	5 (9)	53 (91)	58 (100)
Other	1 (5)	20 (95)	21 (100)
Total	14 (7)	192 (93)	206 (100)

F. Wisconsin

	Accuracy	Accuracy of denial		
Reason	improper	proper	Total	
Able issue	4 (25)	12 (75)	16 (100)	
Available issue	19 (35)	35 (65)	54 (100)	
Work search issue	1 (7)	14 (93)	15 (100)	
Disqualifying/unreported income	10 (22)	35 (78)	45 (100)	
Refusal of work	1 (50)	1 (50)	2 (100)	
Reporting/registration violation	6 (13)	40 (87)	46 (100)	
Other	3 (12)	22 (88)	25 (100)	
Total	44 (22)	159 (78)	203 (100)	

Source: Tabulated from Denied Claims Accuracy Pilot records for September 1997 through September 1998.

Table 4-10A
Monetary Denial Case Error Rates, Unadjusted and Adjusted for Appeals,
Redeterminations, and Agency Resolution of Issues, by State
(percentage erroneous denials with frequencies in parentheses)

			Error Rate Adjusted	I for:
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
	Error rate	Appeals & re-	Agency	
State	<u>unadjusted</u>	determinations	<u>resolution</u>	All factors
Nebraska	10.1	10.1	9.6	9.6
riosraona	(20/198)	(20/198)	(19/198)	(19/198)
New Jersey	12.6	12.6	8.2	8.2
Tion colocy	(23/182)	(23/182)	(15/182)	(15/182)
South Carolina	23.4	23.4	16.2	16.2
	(45/198)	(45/198)	(31/192)	(31/192)
West Virginia	15.1	15.1	13.5	13.5
3	(19/126)	(19/126)	(17/126)	(17/126)
Wisconsin	18.2	18.2	9.4	9.4
	(37/203)	(37/203)	(19/203)	(19/203)
All Five Pilot States	16.0	16.0	11.2	11.2
	(144/901)	(144/901)	(101/901)	(101/901)

Table 4-10B
Separation Denial Case Error Rates, Unadjusted and Adjusted for Appeals,
Redeterminations, and Agency Resolution of Issues, by State
(percentage erroneous denials with frequencies in parentheses)

			Error Rate Adjusted	for:
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
	Error rate	Appeals & re-	Agency	
State	<u>unadjusted</u>	determinations	<u>resolution</u>	All factors
Nebraska	4.0	3.5	4.0	3.5
	(8/200)	(7/200)	(8/200)	(7/200)
New Jersey	11.3	7.2	9.7	6.2
·	(22/195)	(14/195)	(19/195)	(12/195)
South Carolina	5.0	3.0	4.0	3.0
	(10/200)	(6/200)	(8/200)	(6/200)
West Virginia	3.4	2.9	3.4	2.9
· ·	(7/208)	(6/208)	(7/208)	(6/208)
Wisconsin	19.7	17.2	18.7	16.3
	(40/203)	(35/203)	(38/203)	(33/203)
All Five Pilot States	8.7	6.8	8.0	6.4
	(87/1,006)	(68/1,006)	(80/1,006)	(64/1,006)

Table 4-10C
Nonseparation Denial Case Error Rates, Unadjusted and Adjusted for Appeals,
Redeterminations, and Agency Resolution of Issues, by State
(percentage erroneous denials with frequencies in parentheses)

			Error Rate Adjusted	for:
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
	Error rate	Appeals & re-	Agency	
State	<u>unadjusted</u>	determinations	<u>resolution</u>	All factors
Nebraska	14.0	14.0	13.5	13.5
	(28/200)	(28/200)	(27/200)	(27/200)
New Jersey	14.4	12.3	13.9	11.8
•	(28/195)	(24/195)	(27/195)	(23/195)
South Carolina	18.5	18.0	17.5	17.0
	(37/200)	(36/200)	(35/200)	(34/200)
West Virginia	6.8	6.3	6.3	5.8
3	(14/206)	(13/206)	(13/206)	(12/206)
Wisconsin	21.7	20.2	17.7	16.3
	(44/203)	(41/203)	(36/203)	(33/203)
All Five Pilot States	15.0	14.1	13.8	12.9
	(151/1,004)	(142/1,004)	(138/1,004)	(129/1,004)

Table 4-11 Combined Wage Claims and Denial Case Error Rates, by Type of Investigation and State

	Number of Cases	Percent <u>CWC</u>	Error Rat	e (percent) Non-CWC
Monetary Investigations				
Nebraska	198	5.6	36.4	8.6
New Jersey	182	0.0		12.6
South Carolina	192	2.1	25.0	23.4
West Virginia	126	13.5	76.5	5.5
Wisconsin	203	4.4	11.1	18.7
All Five Pilot States	901	4.6	46.3	14.5
Separation Investigations				
Nebraska	200	4.5	0.0	4.2
New Jersey	195	3.6	14.3	11.2
South Carolina	200	3.5	14.3	4.7
West Virginia	208	8.7	0.0	3.7
Wisconsin	203	2.0	25.0	19.6
All Five Pilot States	1,006	4.4	6.7	8.7
Nonseparation Investigatio	ns			
Nebraska	200	1.5	0.0	14.2
New Jersey	195	3.6	14.3	14.4
South Carolina	200	2.0	25.0	18.4
West Virginia	206	5.3	0.0	7.2
Wisconsin	203	1.0	0.0	21.9
All Five Pilot States	1,004	2.7	7.4	15.3

Source: Tabulations of variables for Combined Wage Claims in DCA subsystem data base.

Table 4-12 Response Rates and Methods Used to Obtain Information in DCA Investigations, by Type of Investigation and State

	Method Used to Obtain Information					
	In-person	<u>Telephone</u>	<u>Mail</u>	<u>Nonresponse</u>		
Monetary Investigations						
Nebraska	4.0	48.0	12.6	35.4		
New Jersey	7.7	13.7	21.4	57.1		
South Carolina	46.9	50.0	0.5	2.6		
West Virginia	8.0	31.0	46.8	21.4		
Wisconsin	51.2	19.2	6.9	22.7		
Separation Investigations						
Nebraska	8.0	55.0	13.5	23.5		
New Jersey	28.2	31.8	18.5	21.5		
South Carolina	67.0	30.0	0.0	3.0		
West Virginia	2.9	31.7	42.3	23.1		
Wisconsin	48.8	17.7	7.4	26.1		
Nonseparation Investigations						
Nebraska	3.0	61.0	15.5	20.5		
New Jersey	20.0	26.7	21.5	31.8		
South Carolina	62.0	36.5	0.0	1.5		
West Virginia	3.9	17.5	61.2	17.5		
Wisconsin	51.2	23.2	8.4	17.2		

Source: Tabulations of variable for "primary method claimant information obtained" in DCA subsystem data base.

Table 4-13
Denial Case Error Rates by Whether Information Was Obtained from the Claimant,
Type of Investigation and State
(Error rates in percent with frequencies in parentheses)

	Information Obtained	No response
Monetary Investigations		
Nebraska	10.9	8.6
New Jersey	(14/128) 18.0	(6/70) 8.6
South Carolina	(14/78) 24.1	(9/104) 0.0
West Virginia	(45/187) 15.2	(0/5) 14.8
Wisconsin	(15/99) 22.3 (35/157)	(4/27) 4.4 (2/46)
Separation Investigations		
Nebraska	5.2	0.0
New Jersey	(8/153) 11.8	(0/47) 9.5
South Carolina	(18/153) 5.2	(4/42) 0.0
West Virginia	(10/194) 4.4	(0/6) 0.0
Wisconsin	(7/160) 20.7 (31/150)	(0/48) 17.0 (9/53)
Nonseparation Investigations		
Nebraska	15.1	9.8
New Jersey	(24/159) 17.3	(4/41) 8.1
South Carolina	(23/133) 18.8 (37/407)	(5/62) 0.0
West Virginia	(37/197) 7.1 (42/470)	(0/3) 5.6
Wisconsin	(12/170) 20.8 (35/168)	(2/36) 25.7 (9/35)

Source: Tabulations of variable for "primary method claimant information obtained" and "action flag"in DCA subsystem data base.

Table 4-14 Crosstabulations of Separation Denial Accuracy by Modified QPI Pass/Fail (frequencies with row percentages in parentheses)

A. All five pilot states

QPI score				
DCA finding	fail	pass	<u>Total</u>	
Improper denial	54 (67)	27 (33)	81 (100)	
Proper denial	233 (28)	603 (72)	836 (100)	
Total	287 (31)	630 (69)	917 (100)	
B. Nebraska	ODI			
DCA finding	fail	score	Total	
Improper denial	7 (88)	<u>pass</u> 1 (13)	8 (100)	
Proper denial	48 (25)	141 (75)	189 (100)	
i roper demai	` ,	` ,		
Total	55 (28)	142 (72)	197 (100)	
C. New Jersey	ODI			
DCA finding	fail	score	Total	
Improper denial	19 (95)	<u>pass</u> 1 (5)	20 (100)	
Proper denial	100 (59)	69 (41)	169 (100)	
•	` ,	` '	, ,	
Total	119 (63)	70 (37)	189 (100)	
D. South Carolina				
DOA (" . I"		score	. <u> </u>	
DCA finding	<u>fail</u>	pass (50)	Total	
Improper denial	5 (50)	5 (50)	10 (100)	
Proper denial	24 (13)	166 (87)	190 (100)	
Total	29 (15)	171 (86)	200 (100)	
E. West Virginia				
		score	<u>. </u>	
DCA finding	<u>fail</u>	pass	<u>Total</u>	
Improper denial	2 (40)	3 (60)	5 (100)	
Proper denial	22 (18)	103 (82)	125 (100)	
Total	24 (18)	106 (82)	130 (100)	
F. Wisconsin	0.51			
DCA finding		score	Total	
DCA finding Improper denial	<u>fail</u> 21 (55)	<u>pass</u> 17 (45)	Total	
Proper denial	39 (24)	124 (76)	38 (100) 163 (100)	
i Topei delliai	` ,	` ,		
Total	60 (30)	141 (70)	201 (100)	

Table 4-15 Crosstabulations of Nonseparation Denial Accuracy by Modified QPI Pass/Fail (frequencies with row percentages)

A. All five pilot states

A. All five pilot state			
DCA finding	fail	score	Total
Improper denial	78 (55)	<u>pass</u> 65 (45)	143 (100)
Proper denial	161 (21)	607 (79)	768 (100)
Total	239 (26)	672 (74)	911 (100)
B. Nebraska			
-		score	-
DCA finding	<u>fail</u>	<u>pass</u>	Total
Improper denial	20 (80)	5 (20)	25 (100)
Proper denial	29 (17)	139 (83)	168 (100)
Total	49 (25)	144 (75)	193 (100)
C. New Jersey			
		score	
DCA finding	<u>fail</u>	pass	Total
Improper denial	20 (71)	8 (29)	28 (100)
Proper denial	50 (30)	114 (70)	164 (100)
Total	70 (36)	122 (64)	192 (100)
D. South Carolina	0.01		
DOA fination or		score	Tatal
DCA finding	<u>fail</u>	pass 24 (F7)	Total
Improper denial Proper denial	16 (43) 35 (21)	21 (57) 128 (79)	37 (100) 163 (100)
Proper derilai	` '	` ,	` ,
Total	51 (26)	149 (75)	200 (100)
E. West Virginia			
DCA finalina		score	Total
DCA finding	<u>fail</u>	pass 9 (73)	Total
Improper denial Proper denial	3 (27) 21 (18)	8 (73) 97 (82)	11 (100) 118 (100)
Proper denial	21 (10)	97 (02)	116 (100)
Total	24 (19)	105 (81)	129 (100)
F. Wisconsin	0.01		
DOA finalinan		score	Tatal
DCA finding	<u>fail</u>	<u>pass</u>	Total
Improper denial Proper denial	19 (45) 26 (17)	23 (55) 129 (83)	42 (100) 155 (100)
i Topei delliai	` '	` ,	, ,
Total	45 (23)	152 (77)	197 (100)

Table 4-16
Appeals by Finding of DCA Investigation and by Result of QPI Assessment:
Separation Determinations
(frequencies with row percentages in parentheses)

Finding of DCA Investigation	Not appealed	<u>Appealed</u>	Total
Denial Erroneous	63	24	87
	(72%)	(28%)	(100%)
Denial Proper	769	150	919
	(84%)	(16%)	(100%)
Result of QPI Assessment	Not appealed	<u>Appealed</u>	Total
Failed QPI	228	63	291
	(78%)	(22%)	(100%)
Passed QPI	539	94	633
	(85%)	(15%)	(100%)

Table 4-17
Appeals by Finding of DCA Investigation and by Result of QPI Assessment:
Nonseparation Determinations
(frequencies with row percentages in parentheses)

Finding of DCA Investigation	Not appealed	<u>Appealed</u>	Total
Denial Erroneous	138	13	151
	(91%)	(9%)	(100%)
Denial Proper	795	58	853
	(93%)	(7%)	(100%)
Result of QPI Assessment	Not appealed	<u>Appealed</u>	Total
Failed QPI	216	24	240
	(90%)	(10%)	(100%)
Passed QPI	632	43	675
	(94%)	(6%)	(100%)

Table 4-18
Components of QPI as a Predictor of Denied Claims Accuracy
(Ordinary least squares estimates with standard errors in parentheses; dependent variable equals 1 if denial was correct, 0 if incorrect)

	Type of Denial		
Component of QPI	Separation	<u>Nonseparation</u>	
Claimant information adequate	-0.116	-0.072	
	(0.029)**	(0.033)*	
Employer information adequate	-0.023	0.012	
	(0.027)	(0.041)	
Other information adequate	0.166	0.093	
	(0.034)**	(0.039)*	
Rebuttal opportunity provided	-0.041	-0.010	
	(0.017)*	(0.036)	
Provisions of law and policy met	0.228	0.200	
	(0.031)**	(0.035)**	
Written determination adequate	0.039	0.076	
	(0.022)	(0.028)**	
Constant	0.708	0.610	
	(0.037)**	(0.055)**	
Number of observations	902	895	
R-squared	0.15	0.14	

Notes: Dependent variable is a dummy variable equal to 1 if the denial was correct, 0 otherwise.

^{*} denotes significance at 5% level; ** denotes significance at 1% level.

Table 4-19 Relationships between Characteristics of Claimants and the Likelihood of Proper Denial: Regression Analysis (Ordinary least squares estimates with standard errors in parentheses; dependent variable equals 1 if

denial was correct, 0 if incorrect)

		Type of Investigation	
Independent variable	Monetary	<u>Separation</u>	Nonseparation
Age	-0.003	-0.002	0.001
	(0.001)*	(0.001)	(0.001)
Male	-0.065	-0.005	0.031
	(0.034)	(0.023)	(0.028)
U.S. citizen	0.007	-0.126	0.087
	(0.111)	(0.066)	(0.078)
Ethnicity:			
Black	0.044	0.003	-0.007
	(0.041)	(0.026)	(0.036)
Hispanic	-0.039	-0.084	-0.068
	(0.073)	(0.057)	(0.069)
American Indian	-0.209	-0.401	-0.137
	(0.225)	(0.201)*	(0.207)
Asian/Pacific Islander	-0.008	0.042	0.004
	(0.157)	(0.131)	(0.099)
Caucasian	ref	ref	ref
O a la sa l'as a			
Schooling:	0.000	0.000	0.007
less than high school	-0.006	-0.003	0.007
aama aallaaa	(0.038)	(0.028)	(0.037)
some college	0.055	-0.014	0.011
	(0.051)	(0.030)	(0.036)
college degree	0.003	-0.055 (0.038)	-0.021 (0.043)
high ashaal graduata	(0.066) ref	(0.038) ref	(0.043) ref
high school graduate	rei	rei	iei
Wage in usual job:			
less than \$6/hr	0.166	-0.017	-0.014
1000 111011 \$0,111	(0.059)**	(0.038)	(0.047)
\$6 to \$7/hr	0.136	0.008	0.008
φο το φιγιιι	(0.064)*	(0.040)	(0.049)
\$7 to \$9/hr	-0.003	-0.032	-0.076
¥ ¥	(0.059)	(0.034)	(0.041)
\$9 to \$12/hr	0.029	0.002	-0.064
φο το φ. Ξ/	(0.063)	(0.036)	(0.040)
greater than \$12/hr	,	,	,
_			
State:			
New Jersey	-0.019	0.089	0.042
	(0.049)	(0.033)**	(0.042)
South Carolina	-0.115	0.145	-0.005
	(0.046)*	(0.033)**	(0.041)
West Virginia	0.069	0.162	0.110
	(0.050)	(0.031)**	(0.039)**
Wisconsin	ref	ref	ref

Table 4-19 (continued)

	Type of Investigation			
Independent variable	Monetary	<u>Separation</u>	Nonseparation	
Combined wage claim	-0.437	na	na	
Congration include:	(0.081)**			
Separation issues:		0.000		
Voluntary quit	na	-0.003 (0.022)	na	
Other separation issue	na	-0.401	na	
Caror coparation locae	iia	(0.098)**	i i d	
Discharge	na	ref	na	
Nonseparation issues:				
available issue	na	na	-0.057	
			(0.044)	
work search issue	na	na	-0.022	
			(0.059)	
disqualifying income	na	na	-0.129	
			(0.053)*	
refusal of work	na	na	-0.100	
			(0.094)	
reporting/registration	na	na	-0.065	
violation			(0.044)	
other nonseparation issue	na	na	-0.036	
			(0.063)	
able issue	ref	ref	ref	
Constant	0.867	1.008	0.777	
Constant	(0.146)**	(0.088)**	(0.108)**	
	(0.140)	(0.000)	(0.100)	
Number of observations	569	733	733	
R-squared	0.13	0.09	0.05	

Notes: Standard errors in parentheses.

* denotes significance at 5% level; ** denotes significance at 1% level.

"ref" denotes reference category in a set of dummy variables.

"na" denotes variable not included in the equation.

⁻⁻ denotes variable dropped because there are no corresponding observations in the sample.

Table 6-1 Staff Hours Spent per Investigation of Denied Claims Accuracy, by Type of Denial, Five DCA Pilot Project States

		Type of Denial		Total Hours Charged
<u>State</u>	<u>Monetary</u>	<u>Separation</u>	Nonseparation	to DCA Pilot
Nebraska	4.1	3.9	4.3	3,692.5
New Jersey	9-11	9-11	9-11	
South Carolina				
West Virginia	3.8	3.8	3.8	4,720
Wisconsin	9.4	8.4	8.4	

Sources: Nebraska estimates are from Joyce (1998); New Jersey estimates are verbal estimates provided during the site visit; West Virginia estimates on hours per investigation are verbal estimates provided during the site visit; West Virginia data on total hours charged are from Redden (1998); Wisconsin estimates are from Mand (1998).

Notes: New Jersey's and West Virginia's estimates are for all three types of denial investigations combined. West Virginia also noted that some staff stopped charging hours to the DCA Pilot Project when it was determined that more time was being charged than was allocated.

Table 7-1
Summary of Denial Case Error Rates by Type, Unadjusted and Adjusted for Appeals,
Redeterminations, and Agency Resolution, 1997-98 and 1987 Denials Pilot Projects
(percentage erroneous denials for all pilot states with five-state range in parentheses)

		Error Rate (%) Adjusted for:		
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
	Error rate (%)	Appeals & re-	Agency	
Type of Denial	<u>unadjusted</u>	<u>determinations</u>	<u>resolution</u>	All factors
1997-98 Pilot				
Monetary	16.0	16.0	11.2	11.2
·	(10 - 23)	(10 - 23)	(8 - 16)	(8 - 16)
Separation	8.7	6.8	8.0	6.4
•	(3 - 20)	(3 - 17)	(3 - 19)	(3 - 16)
Nonseparation	15.0	14.1	13.8	12.9
·	(7 - 22)	(6 - 20)	(6 - 18)	(6 - 17)
1987 Pilot				
Monetary	23	16	na	na
·	(10 - 36)	(7 - 33)		
Separation	15	9	na	na
•	(5 - 29)	(2 - 25)		
Nonseparation	14	11	na	na
•	(7 - 23)	(6 - 21)		

Source: Tables 1-5, 4-10A, 4-10B, and 4-10C.

Table 7-2
Erroneous Denials for which Agency Was Responsible, by Type, 1997-98 and 1987
Denials Pilot Projects
(percentage of errors for which agency was responsible)

	Five-State Average (%)		Five-Stat	Five-State Range (%)	
Type of Denial	Agency alone	Agency jointly	Agency alone	Agency jointly	
1997-98 Pilot					
Monetary	33	46	15-61	32 - 74	
Separation	66	78	50-88	60 - 100	
Nonseparation	67	79	52-86	68 - 100	
1987 Pilot					
Monetary	27	na	20-33	na	
Separation	73	na	47-100	na	
Nonseparation	71	na	48-93	na	

Note: Results from the 1987 and 1997-98 pilots are not directly comparable because in 1987, responsibility was assigned to a single party, whereas in 1997-98, responsibility could be assigned either to a single party or jointly to multiple parties.

Source: Tables 1-6 and 4-5.

Table 7-3
Crosstabulations of Separation and Nonseparation Denial Accuracy by Modified QPI Pass/Fail, All Five Pilot States
(frequencies with row percentages)

A. Separation Denial Accuracy by Modified QPI Pass/Fail

	QPI		
DCA finding	fail	pass	Total
Improper denial	54 (67)	27 (33)	81 (100)
Proper denial	233 (28)	603 (72)	836 (100)
Total	287 (31)	630 (69)	917 (100)

B. Nonseparation Denial Accuracy by Modified QPI Pass/Fail

	QPI		
DCA finding	fail	pass	Total
Improper denial	78 (55)	65 (45)	143 (100)
Proper denial	161 (21)	607 (79)	768 (100)
Total	239 (26)	672 (74)	911 (100)

Source: Tables 4-14 and 4-15.