**WorkforceGPS**

**Transcript of Webinar**

**WIOA Joint Data Validation Overview**

**Wednesday, February 6, 2019**

*Transcript by*

*Noble Transcription Services*

*Murrieta, CA*

CHRISTINA ECKENROTH: (In progress) – areas and why we aren't talking about statistical sampling. We're moving away from that into a different direction, so there's no specific statistical validation methodology. There's no specific data validation software identified or required, and the guidance really just sets parameters for how states should ensure that data quality is consistent with all of the Department's guidance.

We're asking you to develop your own data validation procedures. That said, the Departments may be asking states on a regular basis what your process is in helping you to work through particular issues that we may bring up regarding your data. So with that, we're going to move on to the purpose of data validation.

What exactly is data validation? It's to verify that the performance data you're required to report to the Department is valid, accurate, reliable, and also comparable across programs. Data validation helps us to identify anomalies and correct those issues. If it's a problem that may be occurring in your data, we can head those off and make those corrections early on. To outline source documentation – so how do you know that your data is valid? Well, there's the mechanisms that are engaged in the reporting mechanisms, but also we provide you with source documentation in the guidance that has been issued jointly.

It says, how do you know if a credential is really a credential that the staff understood the definition and it was correctly input? We provide information and source documentation that can help states identify what the acceptable proof or evidence for that element is. And the overall course arching goal is to improve program performance and accountability. So with that overview, we're going to jump into some more specifics.

And with that, I'll turn it over to Jay LeMaster. Jay?

JAY LEMASTER: Oh, thank you, Christina. Hi, everybody. This part of the presentation deals with what the data validation procedures must include. Once the state program –and each state program can develop their own data validation procedures – once that has been done, it's important to put those procedures in writing. And then once they're in writing, of course, the next step is to conduct regular training with appropriate staff. And once you've done that training, to monitor that the training that you've done has been actually implemented by the appropriate staff.

The other thing that's very important – let's go to slide 10 – the other thing that's very important is that to do a regular examination or evaluation of your data to make sure that there aren't any errors in it, you might have some electronic data checks in place that do this in your data system.

And then also, it's important for this regular review to keep in mind that it's not just the system checking electronically, but it's also important for staff to do some of this manually, because some of the things that might not make sense or might make sense to, say, a computer, wouldn't make sense to a human eye that looks at something and says, oh, gee, this doesn't make sense to me. This looks like an anomaly.

So not everything can be perfectly checked with an automatic data validation. What's also important is once you've identified errors and you've corrected them, it's important to document that those errors have been addressed and they've been corrected. So that documentation part of it is very important too.

And the last step in all of this is to – once you've developed those data validation procedures, you've trained on them, you've put them in writing, you've trained on them, you've monitored their implementation, you've reviewed your data, you've documented – once you've gone through an entire cycle, it's really important to evaluate, to assess: Is my data validation process even effective? So that's really important to do.

And I think that rounds out what we're talking about here in terms of the data validation procedures. But let's go to the next slide and talk about two things: required and optional data validation. We're going to talk about today – and Toquir's going to talk about next – is the 24 common data elements that have been identified in the guidance that must be validated. However, the guidance also talks about that the state can certainly require additional documentation. The state can add to that. There's nothing preventing the state from doing so.

If there's nothing in the joint guidance that speaks directly to your program, you can certainly require your program staff to obtain or submit or maintain appropriate documentation that validates the data that you're submitting for your program. And sometimes states will collect additional data elements that are important within the state.

And so this is what we're talking about here is that the state can do that. But again, it's important to note that – we've gotten this question already in advance so many times, that it's important to note that these data validation procedures are not monolithic. They're not required for all core programs in the entire state.

So each core program can develop, if they wish, they're own data validation procedures and put those in place and implement them and train on them and monitor them. So that's important to note as well. Now I'm going to turn it over to Toquir.

TOQUIR AHMED: Great. Thank you, Jay. Hi, everyone. So I'll talk about source documentation and Attachment 1. So the 24 elements Jay mentioned in the previous slides are listed here and included in Attachment 1. I certainly won't go over all of these elements or read them out. We really put this list together for you to use. We had some states requesting a comprehensive list. Sometimes the PDF versions aren't always user friendly, and it's difficult to copy and paste from. So this list is here for you.

Also, Jay mentioned earlier that you're encouraged to validate beyond these elements. We recently had a question about what source documentation to require for elements that we are not requiring states to validate on. And again, it's really up to the state to decide, number one, which additional elements do you want to validate, and what source documentation that you want to require for this element.

We do have a helpful tip here we can offer. So when requiring source documentation for elements beyond this list, you can look for elements that are similar to any of the ones being validated. So for example, we're validating wages 2nd quarter after exit quarter. But we don't require wages 1st, 3rd, or 4th quarter after exit. So in those cases, it's reasonable to require the same source documentation for those elements. But again, it's up to you, it's up to the state to decide which elements you want to validate in addition to this list, and what source documentation you want to require for those elements.

So I want to make a few points about the template, and then we'll go over some examples. For those of you familiar with PIRL, you can see that it was developed from the joint PIRL. We literally took the latest PIRL at the time, added a few columns, and decided which elements we wanted to validate.

From there all three agencies began populating source documentation requirements. If you are familiar with PIRL, you also know that it was amended recently. So we want to caution against referring to these elements as the latest. To access the latest PIRL or RSA-911, we have included links in the guidance. Again, this attachment is to outline source documentation, not the latest joint elements.

Also in Attachment 1, there are some instructions and definitions provided. It's important to note the definitions for the types of source documentation, which include: cross match, self-attestation, case notes, and electronic records. These terms can be vague, so we want to make sure all programs are on the same page and finding them the same way.

OK. For this first example, we have data element 901 date of exit. The first column is the PIRL data element number. The second column is the RSA-911 number. And then we have the data element itself. And then the last column outlines the source documentation requirements.

You'll notice above each data element, it says one of the following – and we did this to accommodate all programs and understand that some requirements may not be applicable to certain programs. The second example, the same setup for this as the date of exit. You have the ability to choose one of the following to satisfy the requirement. This list is the same for the 2nd quarter after exit and employment in the 1st, 3rd, and 4th quarter after exit. So for all those data elements, we're requiring the same list of acceptable source documentation.

And then the last example, Jay's favorite, MSG data element is the same setup here as well. You can choose any of the following to validate the element. So that's it for source documentation. And now I'll turn it over to Chris to discuss federal review.

CHRISTOPHER POPE: Thanks, Toquir. We thought we would spend just a couple minutes talking about what federal oversight of these guidelines might entail from the three federal agencies that have oversight responsibilities for the six core programs. So as ETA, RSA, and OCTAE go about reviewing their state agency's policies and procedures for data validation, whether that's through onsite monitoring or other oversight activities, we listed some things that those federal-level reviews might include.

So you'll see here that ETA, RSA, and OCTAE may take a look at your state agency's policies, your procedures, your protocols, how you've trained your state program staff, and how you've deployed use of those policies. We might take a look at your entire validation process, including any state data systems or case management systems that state programs use to collect and report this data or information to your federal agency. And then we also might take a look at your state agency's data validation methodology to get a sense of how you're collecting and using all of this information for program improvement.

So again, ETA, RSA, and OCTAE will incorporate their oversight of these policies and procedures into their regular monitoring or oversight activities. We're going to switch gears a little bit here and start a little state sharing and discussion. We thought it would be a good idea for those participating in the webinar to talk about what they've done already and any challenges that they're facing, anything that they might have learned as they've started to think about data validation of these required data points.

So we've opened up a chat box here where we ask webinar participants to type in based on some of these questions that Toquir, Jay, and I are going to pose. So the first one we wanted to put out there is: Do you have procedures for data validation in your state or in your state's program? And how have you adapted those procedures based on your experience in implementing them?

I see that multiple participants are typing here, so we'll wait to see some of the things that come in. So we're seeing a couple questions here that we'll get to in the Q&A section. But right now, we're sort of curious about where you might be in your state with data validation policies and procedures. So it looks like Nevada has a state policy. But they're in the process of monitoring it due to the guidance that ETA issued in the TEGL format.

Looks like Andrew from Idaho vocational rehabilitation is in the process of creating some written procedures based on the guidance they've received so far. So that's good to hear.

MR. LEMASTER: There's my buddy Vino from New York, Vino Seleca (ph). They've got validation procedures for their local programs.

MR. POPE: Looks like a couple people are commenting that they were waiting on this joint policy from the Departments of labor and Education before they began their database validation policies and procedures. Nathanial from North Carolina is talking about how their state board there has required data validation for self-attestations by further documentation after enrollment, and is asking if other states are requiring validation of self-attestation and how are the local areas addressing that?

It's good to see that Pennsylvania has validation procedures in place. And Oregon has a state policy in place for the Title I programs. Michigan was waiting to hear some additional guidance from the Departments. Casey is noting that the data validation elements from the previous ETA TEGL were reduced significantly and is asking why. And perhaps we can address that later in the Q&A. Jennie from Maine is talking about DEV manual, and in the past has offered statewide training on that manual to go over any errors that were found in their data to address the PIRL elements.

Elaine is asking what is considered joint about creating these policies. I guess we'll just reiterate there that the policy from the Departments of Labor and Education ask that the state and/or state Agencies at their discretion develop these policies.

MR. LEMASTER: Elaine is our state director of adult education in Missouri. And this is Jay LeMaster, federal Adult Education Office. And Elaine, what is joint about this is certainly the fact that we have identified the 24 common data elements. That's really what we wanted to do here is identify those common data elements. And then also when we're doing that, in the far right-hand column, as Toquir was showing us, the documentation column, to give all the core programs a list of documentation that they can choose from.

But that is really what is joint about it. But at the state level, the joint piece is also that the core programs at the state level will be validating those same 24 common data elements. So it's joint at the federal. It's joint at the state level, and specifically for those 24 common data elements. I'm sorry. Go ahead.

MR. POPE: Yeah. Thanks, Jay. This is Chris from RSA. I'll just add for the VR program that these 24 joint PIRL elements, 22 of them only apply to the VR program. You'll notice that the 23rd and the 24th elements in Attachment 1 are related to the use, 2nd quarter placement for Title I only. So the remaining 22 data validation elements that we're asking states to have source documentation for correspond to about 33 data elements on the RSA-911. And if you have questions about those, you can reach out to us through RSAData@ed.gov.

You'll notice, for example, that a type of training service No. 1 corresponds to 8 different RSA-911 elements related to training, such as occupational or vocational training provided that a VR agency might purchase and we're asking for source documentation to substantiate the reporting of that service. That question we were going to ask was about conducting regular training. And we're getting a lot of responses about that in that chat as well. If so, if you have done training in your state or in your specific state program, how often have you trained your staff on adhering to the policies that you've developed?

And any strategies that you might have for training that you think have been helpful we'd be certainly interested to hear about. So Washington is saying that they haven't done any training. We're seeing some annual training. California, the state hasn't conducted regular data validation. They probably haven't done a lot of training.

MR. LEMASTER: So what's important to note about this screen is that we're getting responses from one person in the state. And I think it's important for our participants to understand that when you see that, for example, Miranda's saying that Washington hasn't provided any training yet, I believe that that would not apply to, for example, the adult education program, because I do know that they provide training at least for Title II in Washington state.

So when I just say to the participants when you're looking at this, one of the main purposes of this webinar is for you to learn from your colleagues and what they've done in terms of implementation already, what they've done so far in carrying out data validation procedures. But also, don't jump to conclusions when you see that somebody says it might not always apply to the entire state when they give a response. Just want to make sure that people know that.

MR. POPE: Looks like Jerry from Indiana is saying that the adult Ed program there trains two times a year. So it's likely that the VR program or the Title I or III programs have conducted separate training. Looks like in Denver at the local level, they have program and data validation training weekly with their staff and monthly provided from the county level. So it sounds like that might pertain to Title I or III programs. Looks like we're talking about some annual, in-person training and some once yearly webinar training for our case management system, and then one-on-one technical assistance as needed specific staff, it sounds like.

All right. Thanks for sharing about how often you're conducting training. And I'm going to hand it over to my colleagues here to talk about some of these other chat boxes.

MR. LEMASTER: OK. Thank you, Chris. Let's go to the next question. And one other thing I wanted to say is as you're looking at these responses, everybody, and maybe you saw a name of somebody and you saw the state that they're talking about and you saw something that sounded interesting to you, I would really would encourage you to go ahead and see if you can follow up with that person, because one of the nice things that we would like to see come out of this webinar is for states to learn and share with other states. So I think that would be a good outcome.

Our next question is: What are your state agency's monitoring protocols to ensure that program staff are following the written data validation procedures? So what we're really asking here is – just in a sentence or a couple words – what do you do in your state to? – remember we were talking about earlier on this slide about your training your appropriate staff, and then you need to also monitor to make sure that that's being implemented what has been trained on. So this is what this question is about. What are you doing to ensure that the training you provided is actually being carried out? I see that multiple people are typing.

There's Vino from New York in adult education. They have an accountability specialist who regularly monitors the local program data and provide technical assistance. Then we've got Casey: Audits are completed at eligibility. Tim Robinson: Our monitoring team in Washington state for WIOA Title I has a comprehensive monitoring tool that is very helpful – lots of great responses here. Colorado Title I and 3 have rolled out data validation into our quarterly monitoring visits – very good. In Montana for Title I, our MIS monitoring is focused on data validation.

Mandatory data validation checks on participant files during annual program monitor of subrecipients that is – going by so quickly. It's like trying to read a ticker tape. Let's see. I'll start at the bottom. Bruce Allisky (ph), he says: Within our (pack ?) unit, we cross confirm our data and use standardized checklists for our WIOA Title I work and other wage-related data validation – very good. Lots of great ways people are monitoring their data validation protocol.

So this was one of those bullets that we had earlier on in the presentation about not just training, but also an important part of it is what you're training is, is that actually be implemented by the staff who receive that training? There's Leslie Dawson, Alabama Title IV – that's a voc rehab program: Our local supervisors monitor participant files each month, and we have designated staff at the state level that monitor this as well – excellent, very good.

MR. POPE: Here, Leslie. Hello.

MR. LEMASTER: Yes. That's a double layer there, which is always good to have another pair of eyes on things like this. Terry Tackett: We do desk audits. Terry's in adult Ed in Kentucky. We do desk audits monthly with visits and more intense monitoring, and have the state auditors monitor III0 programs every year – wow, very good.

Let's jump up to Connecticut there. Sabrina Mancini: Connecticut Department of Education regularly monitors local adult education data and offers technical assistance. OK. Peggy Stadler. Leslie Dawson says hi. Peggy Stadler: California state SCSEP monitors data validation on the onsite monitoring tool. Let's see here.

Jump down to Serge Cukaric (ph): Oregon Title III quarterly audits by program managers. Go up to Michael Euegart (ph) in New Hampshire – they conduct yearly office monitoring, as well as quarterly desk reviews to ensure program staff are following the written data validation procedures. So I'm seeing a lot of quarterly. I'm seeing even some monthly, which is very good.

This is what it's all about, folks. We're really just – it's just about having eyes on the data and looking at what is happening in terms of post training and implementation. And some of what you're writing here also pertains to that other bullet we talked about, which was reviewing your data on a regular basis for errors and anomalies, so this is very good.

Let's go on to the next question that we're going to have here for our group. We had a lot of responses on that one. That's great. But we certainly want to leave a lot of time for you all to ask questions of your own.

So the next question is – this is a little similar to the previous one – how does your state agency review program data for errors, missing data, out-of-range values, and anomalies? So you know that previous question we were talking about what you do to monitor how your training is being implemented, and some of the responses people gave us kind of led into this question here that we're asking you now.

So we're actually asking you now explicitly what does your state agency do in terms of reviewing your data for anomalies, out-of-range values, missing data? Who does that in your program? And in North Dakota, Stanley says – he's our new adult education state director in North Dakota – and he says: In North Dakota (meet ?), system has its own checks as well. So Stanley, it sounds like he's a one-act show there in North Dakota.

So he's checking his data for out-of-range values and errors and things like that. Angela Lowe: internal QA state performance team data in VOS. What program is that? Does anybody recognize?

MS. ECKENROTH: That's virtual one-stop.

MR. LEMASTER: OK. Very good. Katherine Chavez in Arizona, you utilize Spark (ph) to review reports that's done by state coordinator. Sara Bennet for New Hampshire adult Ed: I do it. I run reports. There we go – lost her. Here we go – Sandy Austin. Let's go down to the bottom. Can we get Sandy Austin? Iowa voc rehab general: We have a data resource manager who monitors the data. In addition, we have an internal control team who reviews files and compares data in the file to data in the case management system quarterly. Data is also reviewed prior to submitting the RSA-911 – very good.

MR. POPE: Yeah. I'd be curious if any of the VRA agencies also use RSA's edit checks for the 911 as part of their policies here to check for anomalies.

MR. LEMASTER: You know, one thing I'm seeing here is – from my adult education perspective, I'm looking at some of our adult education state directors who are state directors in a state where the staff is a very small staff. So I think that's a consideration we have to think about, or states need to think about, is when you do have a small staff. I'm seeing a lot of state directors like Marsha Hess (ph) in Wyoming. It's me since Sara Bennett in New Hampshire, again, another very small staff. And forgive me, Sara. I think it may be even a staff of one. I think that's what you've told me.

So I mean, in a lot of cases like that, it's going to be just that one person. So I think back to what Chris was saying, anything that you can do to leverage technology to help you evaluate and review your data for errors and anomalies and out-of-range values is really going to be a benefit when you are working with a small staff or limited resources. So those are always good things to do. So here we have Jennie Carol: Maine Department of Labor uses WIPS – I've heard that before – errors to identify errors and anomalies and generally inform the provider about the missing or incorrectly entered data on a quarterly basis.

And Jennie also says: Ongoing monthly training through Skype also lets us inform staff of general issues. I really like that. You know, when I was at the state office for my program, we had monthly phone calls with our local staff. And of course, back then it was phone calls – we didn't have Skype. But this is a very good thing to do to keep in touch with your local program with all of your staff in the state, any staff who are involved with this so that everybody can come together and compare notes as to what they're finding.

Or if you have that one person in your state whose responsibility it is to check the data and to identify anomalies and errors, to bring everybody else together to inform them of the results of that kind of activity. So I think that's important too. Wow – lots of great – I think there's a lot of information here. So if you're not doing this in your state, there are a whole bunch of ideas here about how to go about doing that.

MR. POPE: I saw someone asked: Are these lists going to be available in terms of being able to look back at the chat to learn about what people are doing? Is that going to be the case?

MR. LEMASTER: We can provide those, and we can share those, as well, after the event. Definitely, the recording and transcript will be made available on WorkforceGPS in about two business days. All right. Let's go on to the next question. We're going to turn it over to Toquir.

MR. AHMED: Thanks, Jay. So our next question: How do you regularly assess the effectiveness of your state agency's data validation procedures?

MR. LEMASTER: So this was that bullet that we talked about. You've got your procedures in place. You've identified the errors. You've corrected them. How do you know that your data validation procedures are actually working? How do you know that?

MR. AHMED: We have one response so far. Angela says: identifying common trends weekly during case reviews and reports. Denice said: common trends with monthly audits and reports. Bruce says: usually, through internal procedures and combined with feedback from Feds and our response to it.

MR. LEMASTER: I guess if data errors slip through to the federal level and you hear about it, that means maybe there's some tweaking that could be done at the state level in terms of data validation procedures. Edna's saying: Somebody doesn't have their phone on mute. No. We're shaking our heads because the participants don't have –

MR. AHMED: Everyone is needed right now so there's no way that –-

MR. LEMASTER: She might be hearing some people out there, out in the hallway. We're in a room here where maybe some people were walking by in the hallway outside our door.

MR. AHMED: We're in the busy DOL, everyone.

MR. POPE: It looks like a couple people have mentioned some of the data dashboards that RSA has provided that kind of provide like a QA check following the completion of a quarter to make sure that their data looks accurate and reliable. It's good to hear that those are helpful.

MR. LEMASTER: I like what Edna Snyder said: seeing the number of missing or error items going down. That's a great indicator that your procedures are working.

MR. AHMED: Here we go. Looks like someone from DOL: Kansas has edit checks in the case management system. These Ed checks are based on the PIRL specs which assist with data validation effort in real-time.

There's also a document uploader, which catalogs documentation for monitoring purposes. Oregon spot checks records in the system of our records against the PIRL. That's interesting. I'd like to see that. Terry says again: The MIS does a lot of edit checks. MIS system will put clients in staging areas for programs to address and correct.

Looks like Glen (ph) uses the number of referrals to the WIOA program and the GS system software we use to track the number and quality of people referred to a job or by workforce center personnel. And then we would gauge WHP was hired by – who was hired by obtaining reports from employers. Bruce: We also identify flags in our initial quarterly PIRL, mediate them, and submit a final clean PIRL. Those edit checks are built into our data processing and recycled every quarter. New edits are appended as needed. So we're using the PIRL and edit checks quite a bit.

MR. LEMASTER: You know, I like what Vino says: We have to make sure that programs are not just working to improve the numbers, but actually improving services. So that's an important thing to remember as well, everybody. The hope is, of course, the goal is when you improve data validation that as a result of that, we are improving services because we have a clearer picture and a valid and reliable picture of our program performance. And only then are we able to make improvements in the program when we actually have solid data that we can use to make those changes with.

MR. POPE: Sounds like Dee in Missouri VR is talking about a couple different levels of internal controls, whether it's supervisor level, reviewing what staff might be entering into their case management system. I know some agencies may use peer reviews of data reported. So it's good to see that you have a variety of different checkpoints for that.

MR. AHMED: All right. So we're going to move to the last discussion question. It looks fairly loaded: What challenges do you see for implementing data validation procedures in the future?

MR. LEMASTER: Lots of people typing. By the way, everybody, we have 807 participants in this webinar, so thank you very much. We appreciate your interest and your participation. We really do. This helps us do a better job here by seeing, especially this last question. Please be honest.

Please be specific and tell us the challenges that you see, because this question and your responses to this question will help us develop technical assistance for states, and in at least Title II's case, local providers, but help us also think about here – the federal core programs and partners – to think about maybe some joint technical assistance activities that we can undertake and develop.

So what you're writing in response to this question here is probably going to be very, very helpful in developing and delivering technical assistance to you in the future from our agencies.

MR. AHMED: Yeah. It looks like a lot of people have staff, training, resource issues in general – adopting DP procedures regarding partner programs.

MR. LEMASTER: Wow, this is overwhelming.

MR. POPE: Comment there about wondering if Title I and III agencies will be responsible for data validation in Title II and IV. And as we've talked about, no. That's not the case. If the state decides to implement these procedures uniformly across all their core programs, that's an option. But each core program may develop its own policies and procedures for data validation. Right. We wouldn't expect other entities monitoring other entities.

MR. AHMED: Inadequate state MIS system.

MR. LEMASTER: That's a continuing challenge. We've heard that a lot.

MR. POPE: See small staff size coming up again, limited personnel resources to actually conduct data validation.

MR. AHMED: And then getting documentation from clients, some other requirements seem intrusive and hard to get.

MR. POPE: Which is a fair point. Some source documentation may be difficult to obtain.

MR. LEMASTER: And we have heard some questions about – piggybacking onto that question about should other core programs in the state monitor other core programs in terms of data validation? No. That is not our expectation. And also, we've gotten questions about should I have the same source documentation for every single participant in my program? No. That's not a requirement either. There's a list of source documentation that you can choose from for each common data element.

So you might have – and I don't have the list in front of me – but you might have a particular source document for this participant, but for another participant you may not. And you might choose to use a different. It's all about validating the data. How you validate it, which document you choose from that list is totally up to you, the state. It's up to the core program within the state. And it might even be determined by individual participants from participant to participant. So there's a lot of flexibility and latitude in this guidance for states and for the core programs.

MR. POPE: Yeah. It makes me think, Jay, that some of these data elements have a requiring validation on, especially whether individuals or participants are employed after they exit. If state UI wage record matches are available, great. But maybe that's not always available, then you need to do supplemental wage documentation. These guidelines support that, that in some cases you might have a UI wage record match. And in others you may have needed to obtain supplemental wage info.

I see some people talking about just pulling files from different locations and getting them all in the same place. There might be sort of a manual aspect of this of verifying what documentation might be in case files. So that could be a challenge. We certainly see that.

MR. LEMASTER: Here's one from Damon Weller: Although each title can and should perform data validation for their own data, further information from the U.S. Department of Labor on how to validate a singular combined participant individual record layout, the PIRL, multiple titles with states that have multiple agencies operating with the different titles as the data becomes nondescript about which agency supplied that particular data for each element. So that sounds like something specific to Title I and III maybe, or just Title I. But that's a good point.

MR. POPE: Bruce is making a joke about how pristine his data is in New Hampshire, but I think he's just kidding. Thanks, Bruce.

MS. ECKENROTH: We hear you, Bruce. We hear you.

MR. POPE: It looks like Arlene (ph) is talking about obtaining supplemental wage records and challenges of getting consumer in the VR program to provide employment information and they're perhaps refusing to do so. That certainly could be a barrier to tracking whether an individual is working after they exit the VR program.

MR. LEMASTER: All right. So I think we should go on now to the last part of this webinar, which is on open forum for everybody to ask us questions now. And Christina, do you want to lead us in that, please.

MS. ECKENROTH: Of course. Thanks. And again, thanks, everybody, for your participation in those discussion questions. It was incredibly helpful and it brought up a lot of great information. Now we're leaving the period of time we'd like to answer as many open-ended questions, many of your specific questions as we can in the time frame allotted. But don't worry.

If we are unable to answer your specific question, we have – at the end of the presentation, we have provided contact information for your specific program. So if you have questions that we're not able to get to today, you can contact RSA, ETA, and OCTAE individually at the contact information at the end of the presentation.

So with that, I welcome you to enter in your questions to the chat room. And while folks are doing that, we'll start to address some of the questions we received during the presentation. So, Toquir, would you like to address the question regarding whether or not the Bureau of Labor Statistics, or BLS, is involved in our data validation program?

MR. AHMED: Yeah, sure. So as you mentioned earlier on, we don't have a statistical methodology. Because there's no statistical methodology involved statistical sampling, we did not see the need to work with BLS to develop this guidance. So the answer there is no. BLS was not involved.

MS. ECKENROTH: OK. Thanks, Toquir. We also had a question: So to confirm, are we saying that each state will have its own data validation? So the answer to that is yes. And as the presenters have outlined, each state, each program may also have its specific data validation processes and procedures. However, our goal is that everyone utilize the same general parameters that we've laid out here in the joint guidance. And those 24 shared elements will at minimally all be validated equally or commonly across programs.

And for the DOL folks who are not seeing their specific program or wondering about the additional data validation additional elements, there will be DOL-specific guidance coming out that can address some of those issues. So with that, I'll turn it over to Jay to answer a question regarding credential.

MR. LEMASTER: OK. Well, I guess before we want to do that, I'll go ahead and start with that, and then we're going to get to a question about self-attestation, which Toquir will take care of. The question that we have here is, "What are recognized credential requirements?" And I think it sounds to me like that question could be about the types of credentials, maybe post or secondary credentials that are recognized for that indicator for the credential indicator as an outcome.

I would then direct you to our accountability guidance, which we leased on December 19, 2017. And in there, each of the federal partners released the same guidance under different document types – TEGL, labor, and we did program memorandum, and RSA did TAC.

And so in there, we talk about the types of credentials that would count as an outcome under the credential indicator. It's not an exhaustive list. And it's also very important to remember that it's a state-recognized credential. I do want to say, though, in terms of documentation – source documentation, if that's what this question's about, then you would go to Attachment 1 of this data validation guidance. And there in the far right-hand column, you would find the source documentation types that would be acceptable in terms of data validation for the credential indicator.

So there's that two-part process. First, which credential is it? Is it an acceptable credential? And then two, go to the data validation guidance, Attachment 1, the far right-hand column, to see what kinds of documents you can use to validate that data. Toquir, you want to take the next question.

MR. AHMED: Sure. Self-attestation according to the definition found in Attachment 1 occurs when a participant states his or her status for a particular data element, such as pregnant or parenting youth, and then sign and date the form acknowledging this status. The key elements for self-attestation are: A, the participant identifying his or her status for permitted elements; and B, signing and dating a form attesting to the self-identification. The form and signature can be on paper or in the state's management information system with an electronic signature. And that's found in Attachment 1 of the guidance.

MR. LEMASTER: We have a question here on the screen, "How can information get added to the source documentation list?" I think I tried to cover that earlier in the presentation where we said the state can add whatever source – they can add additional data elements that they want to validate against. Or they can require additional documentation.

But you must have at least one of the document types that are listed in the far right-hand column of that table in Attachment 1 for each data element; you must have at least one of those. But you must choose one of those in terms of validating that data element. But if you as a state program wish to add additional, add other document types, you can do that in addition to maybe whatever is in the column there.

And we already answered the question about what is considered joint about creating these policies. Somebody says: Do the titles have to validate in the same way? No. The answer is no. Titles I, II, III, and IV do not, in the state, have the same validation procedures. We've got a couple duplicate questions here.

We've got some questions about the state wage interchange system, the SWIS. We will have updates on that at some point in the near future. I don't have anything to share with you today about that. When will the development –

MR. POPE: "When will the DEV data validation TEGL for DOL be expected?" We're expecting it later this year. I know that's a vague answer, but it is under development.

MR. LEMASTER: Well, here's a question, "Will there be specific annual data validation as required in prior years in addition to the joint data validation?" There's guidance coming out, we said, from Title I in terms of additional data validation guidance that will be forthcoming. I know that in our program, Title II, we have the data quality checklists. We also have title-specific data elements in adult education that we ask states to validate.

This webinar and this guidance is about joint data validation. This is exactly what we're talking about here is we're talking about just the 24 common data elements that must be validated by all of the core partner programs in the states. So I think we're actually at time here. We've got four minutes, but we actually don't have that much time because for technical reasons we need to wind up at this point. So I guess, Christina, do you want to take us to our last slide after the question slide that we've got one more.

MS. ECKENROTH: Absolutely. So we see a lot of very similar questions coming in. So what we're going to do all together is take a look at the questions we were unable to get to today, and make sure that we communicate some of those general answers to you. So those of you who had a lot of the same questions, we'll be sure to take that in mind then, make sure we get some communication out to the system. However, if you didn't get a chance to answer your question to be answered, something came to you later, you have a question after the webinar, please feel free to reach specifically out to your agency.

And here is the contact information. If you're an RSA, please utilize the RSA email address on the screen. If you are in an ETA program – so that's Title I or III – please be sure to send your question to the ETA Performs email address here. And if you are in adult education, please be sure to reach out to the adult education folks at this address here. Again, we thank everyone for your participation. And I will turn it over to John with some of the wrap-up activities.

JON VEHLOW: All right. Thanks, Christina. I just want to thank all of our participants today – so many of you. Thanks for joining us, and of course our presenters. And if you could just please stay logged into the room just a little bit longer and provide us with some feedback. You'll see some feedback windows where you can let us know what you thought of today's webinar. Please take a second now and share your thoughts. Let us know what you liked or what we can improve on. Also, there's a number of polling questions you can answer too, better help for us to bring you quality content in the future.

There is also an additional topics window where you can let us know what you'd like to hear in future webinars. Just a reminder: Our recording of today's webinar is logged in transcripts. And executive summary will be made available on WorkforceGPS in about two business days.

Also, to better connect with your WorkforceGPS colleagues, please take a few minutes and sign up for the member directory on WorkforceGPS. That link is located at the top of the feedback window. So again, we want to thank everyone for joining us today. And with that, have a wonderful day.

(END)