

<b>EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING ADMINISTRATION ADVISORY SYSTEM U.S. DEPARTMENT OF LABOR Washington, D.C. 20210</b>	<b>CLASSIFICATION</b> Reemployment Services
	<b>CORRESPONDENCE SYMBOL</b> OWI
	<b>DATE</b> October 14, 2005

**TRAINING AND EMPLOYMENT GUIDANCE LETTER NO. 7-05**

**TO:** ALL STATE WORKFORCE AGENCIES /

**FROM:** EMILY STOVER DeROCCO  
Assistant Secretary 

**SUBJECT:** Program Year (PY) 2005 Reemployment Services (RES) Grant Allocation Procedures

1. **Purpose.** To provide grant allocation procedures to state workforce agencies (SWAs) responsible for the RES allotments announced in Training and Employment Guidance Letter (TEGL) No. 23-04.
2. **References.** Wagner-Peyser Act (29 U.S.C. 49 et seq.); Workforce Investment Act of 1998 (WIA), (29 U.S.C. 2801 et seq.) P.L. 106-113; Planning Guidance and Instructions for Submission of Two Years of the Strategic Five-Year State Plan for Title I of the Workforce Investment Act of 1998 and the W-P Act (Federal Register Vol. 70, No. 69, pages 19206 to 19220 (April 12, 2005)); State Unified Planning Guidance (Federal Register Vol. 70, No. 69, pages 19222 to 19252 (April 12, 2005)); TEGL No. 28-04 Common Measures Policy; and TEGL No. 23-04.
3. **Background.** Since PY 2001, the Department of Labor (DOL) has made available approximately \$35 million annually to provide direct reemployment services to unemployment insurance (UI) claimants. These funds supplemented the Wagner-Peyser (W-P) Act state allotments and were intended to enhance and target the core employment services to UI claimants provided within the framework of the workforce investment system and One-Stop Career Centers. States are currently providing reemployment services using the PY 2004 funds in accordance with approved state plans.
4. **Funding for RES in PY 2005.** For PY 2005, \$34,290,464 is provided for direct services to UI claimants. As targeted by the original funding for RES in PY 2001, these funds supplement the W-P Act allotments to increase and enhance services to UI claimants over and above universal core services.

<b>RESCISSIONS</b> None	<b>EXPIRATION DATE</b> Continuing
----------------------------	--------------------------------------

5. **State Distribution Formula.** State RES allotments were determined on the basis of each state's share of UI first payments, with every SWA receiving a minimum of \$215,000. PY 2005 state allotments may be different from PY 2004 due to Congress' appropriated across-the-board reduction of .80 percent and differences in a state's UI first payment activity. RES funding allotments by state were published in TEGL No. 23-04.
6. **Use of the RES Funds.** These funds are intended to improve the quality and the quantity of reemployment services for UI claimants, build on existing initiatives, and target geographic areas where funding is most needed and will have the most positive outcomes. In light of recent changes in economic conditions and increases in service levels for UI claimants, we encourage states to review PY 2004 RES plan implementation and activity to determine if changes, additions, or a refocusing of services are in order for PY 2005.

States are required to provide a full range of seamless services to UI claimants through the One-Stop Career Centers. It is critical for all components of the workforce investment system, One-Stop Career Centers, UI, and other WIA Title I grantees to work together to assure that UI claimants, especially those who have been profiled as likely to exhaust their eligibility for benefits, are provided the assistance needed to return to work as expeditiously as possible. SWAs are to use strategies and service delivery methods that ensure claimants served through call centers are linked to all of the available reemployment services in their One-Stop Career Center service delivery system. See Attachment II for a description of additional activities and resources for improving reemployment services.

7. **Grant Procedures.** In previous program years, each state was required to develop a separate annual RES plan. For PY 2005, these RES funds must be expended in accordance with the state's approved Two Years of the Five Year Strategic Plan for Title I of the Workforce Investment Act of 1998 and the W-P Act. No separate RES plan will be required for this year. RES funds may be expended during the three-year period from July 1, 2005 to June 30, 2008.

To receive allocations, states must submit a completed Standard Form (SF) 424 (Application for Federal Assistance) from the state agency signatory official for Wagner-Peyser grants to the ETA national office Grant Officer at the following address: E. Fred Tello; Office of Grants and Contracts Management/DFA; U.S. Department of Labor - ETA; 200 Constitution Avenue, N.W., Room N-4655; Washington, D.C. 20210. A fax copy may also be submitted, in advance of the mailed original form, to expedite the release of funds. The FAX number is (202) 693-2879. Funds will be provided under the PY2005/FY2006 Wagner-Peyser Annual Funding Agreement through a Notice of Obligation grant modification. Funds are to be expended in accordance with the approved state plan (referenced above), this TEGL and the Agreement which includes the applicable laws and regulations.

## 8. RES Reports

- a. Program Narrative Performance Reports. In addition to the approved Two Years of the Strategic Five-Year State Plan for Title I of the Workforce Investment Act of 1998 and the W-P Act, SWAs must also submit program narrative performance reports approved by OMB under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (Project 1205-0424) through March 2008. Using Employment and Training Administration (ETA) Form 9100, SWAs must submit their program narrative performance reports to the appropriate Regional Administrator and to: Administrator, Office of Workforce Investment, Room S-4231, Attn: Gene Tichenor, 200 Constitution Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20210. This report is due September 30, 2006. SWAs should report all activity and compare the accomplishment of planned performance goals with the attainment of the performance indicators, including state goals identified in the strategic plan. The report should include an explanation of problems or delays, as well as corrective actions plans and resulting outcomes. States are encouraged to discuss their experiences and report any cost savings, especially those to the UI trust fund, occurring as a result of RES program grants.
  - b. Activity and Outcome Reports. To evaluate the success of the services provided to eligible unemployment insurance claimants, ETA will track services and outcomes via the ETA 9002 A through D Reports, the OMB approved Common Measures as described in TEGL No. 28-04, and the ETA 9048 and 9049 Work Profiling and Reemployment Services Activity and Outcome Reports.
  - c. Financial Reports. SWAs must report quarterly expenditures by direct data entry of Standard Form (SF) 269 into the Web-based Enterprise Information Management System (EIMS). Reports must be submitted in accordance with guidance provided in TEGL No. 17-00, Automation of SESA Standard Form 269 Financial Reporting.
9. Action Required. SWAs should immediately transmit these grant allocation procedures to the appropriate staff.
10. Inquiries. Questions regarding this TEGL should be directed to the appropriate regional office. Grant and financial management questions should be directed to the regional office or to Gwendolyn Baron-Simms at 202-693-3309 or to Fred Tello, Grant Officer, at 202-693-3333.

## 11. Attachments.

- I. RES Allotments
- II. Activities & Resources for Improving Reemployment Services

U. S. Department of Labor  
Employment and Training Administration  
**Reemployment Services**  
**PY 2005 vs PY 2004 Allotments**

	PY 2004	PY 2005	Difference	% Diff
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$34,566,846</b>	<b>\$34,290,464</b>	<b>(\$276,382)</b>	<b>-0.80%</b>
Alabama.....	541,555	527,432	(14,123)	-2.61%
Alaska.....	327,778	340,644	12,866	3.93%
Arizona.....	489,941	481,845	(8,096)	-1.65%
Arkansas.....	463,091	446,659	(16,432)	-3.55%
California.....	3,426,275	3,293,551	(132,724)	-3.87%
Colorado.....	482,490	464,292	(18,198)	-3.77%
Connecticut.....	577,098	568,631	(8,467)	-1.47%
Delaware.....	292,968	291,459	(1,509)	-0.52%
District of Columbia.....	265,430	264,302	(1,128)	-0.42%
Florida.....	983,324	996,470	13,146	1.34%
Georgia.....	833,546	780,999	(52,547)	-6.30%
Hawaii.....	286,462	284,093	(2,369)	-0.83%
Idaho.....	355,368	355,891	523	0.15%
Illinois.....	1,256,279	1,288,305	32,026	2.55%
Indiana.....	701,962	712,350	10,388	1.48%
Iowa.....	467,344	465,757	(1,587)	-0.34%
Kansas.....	422,539	406,720	(15,819)	-3.74%
Kentucky.....	537,557	545,415	7,858	1.46%
Louisiana.....	444,676	461,553	16,877	3.80%
Maine.....	290,481	299,081	8,600	2.96%
Maryland.....	516,208	516,514	306	0.06%
Massachusetts.....	894,453	844,407	(50,046)	-5.60%
Michigan.....	1,321,707	1,447,599	125,892	9.52%
Minnesota.....	604,640	616,205	11,565	1.91%
Mississippi.....	389,432	382,486	(6,946)	-1.78%
Missouri.....	643,240	664,572	21,332	3.32%
Montana.....	278,896	279,789	893	0.32%
Nebraska.....	320,695	329,585	8,890	2.77%
Nevada.....	404,041	397,675	(6,366)	-1.58%
New Hampshire.....	269,663	266,825	(2,838)	-1.05%
New Jersey.....	1,049,760	1,113,732	63,972	6.09%
New Mexico.....	299,946	305,139	5,193	1.73%
New York.....	1,631,923	1,596,814	(35,109)	-2.15%
North Carolina.....	1,056,089	971,533	(84,556)	-8.01%
North Dakota.....	252,589	251,061	(1,528)	-0.60%
Ohio.....	1,031,240	1,046,282	15,042	1.46%
Oklahoma.....	396,027	381,081	(14,946)	-3.77%
Oregon.....	656,245	626,031	(30,214)	-4.60%
Pennsylvania.....	1,526,880	1,543,329	16,449	1.08%
Puerto Rico.....	460,276	473,032	12,756	2.77%
Rhode Island.....	314,112	323,378	9,266	2.95%
South Carolina.....	562,104	548,261	(13,843)	-2.46%
South Dakota.....	242,918	243,773	855	0.35%
Tennessee.....	688,395	666,664	(21,731)	-3.16%
Texas.....	1,457,022	1,411,074	(45,948)	-3.15%
Utah.....	353,840	344,741	(9,099)	-2.57%
Vermont.....	281,484	277,870	(3,614)	-1.28%
Virgin Islands.....	221,039	218,389	(2,650)	-1.20%
Virginia.....	614,168	568,182	(45,986)	-7.49%
Washington.....	841,743	810,873	(30,870)	-3.67%
West Virginia.....	341,731	339,116	(2,615)	-0.77%
Wisconsin.....	941,759	955,495	13,736	1.46%
Wyoming.....	256,417	253,508	(2,909)	-1.13%

## Activities and Resources for Improving Reemployment Services

The following activities have been shown to be beneficial in providing effective reemployment services. The following non-exhaustive list of activities is provided to assist in developing an action plan. The activities reflect research results and practical experience providing reemployment services.

1. Integrated Workforce Investment Services. Reemployment Services should be provided in an integrated manner through the One-Stop Career Center system. This is particularly important for State Workforce Agencies (SWAs) doing remote initial claims filing such as telephone claims.
2. More intensive or staff-assisted services. Reviews have found that reemployment services received by unemployment insurance (UI) claimants have not been very intensive nor well matched to client needs. Nearly half the states neither required extensive services nor generally made them available. Only about one-third of the states required claimants to participate 20 or more hours. Of the group who were referred to intensive reemployment activities, only one-third were reported as participating in job search workshops.

Research has found that job search techniques such as increasing the number of employer contacts and expanding job search to include secondary occupations and a broader geographic area were very effective in producing positive outcomes. The combined findings of several state demonstration projects--Minnesota, Nevada, New Jersey, South Carolina and Washington--provide strong evidence that intensive reemployment activities, such as referral to employment opportunities and other forms of job search assistance, are effective and result in positive outcomes.

A report on the Job Search Assistance Demonstration in the District of Columbia (DC) and Florida found that intensive reemployment activities encouraged more aggressive job search efforts, increased the number of employers contacted per week, and increased the hours of job search per week.

3. Early intervention services. There is extensive research (see list of studies at the end of this section) to document that early intervention (e.g., identifying UI claimants who are likely to face lengthy unemployment early in their UI combined with job search and similar services) is an effective approach to providing reemployment services resulting in positive outcomes.
4. Eligibility Review Program (ERP) activities. ERP might be more effective if redesigned to provide services earlier and more frequently and to incorporate job search or other reemployment services in the ERP.
5. Services that are integrated with Remote Initial Claims Filing. Telephone and Internet initial claims are widespread and in some states becoming the only way to apply for UI benefits. While this may increase the efficiency of delivering UI benefits, it poses a serious problem for providing reemployment services. Often, the high cost of telephone service at remote locations prevents customer service representatives (CSRs) from spending more time with UI claimants on the telephone. To assure that UI claimants are provided reemployment services,

agencies should provide CSRs with information and training for referring UI claimants to the One-Stop Career Center system.

6. Services to claimants in targeted occupations or industries. Many states are facing the loss of jobs in specific industries or occupations. Particularly hard hit have been the textile, steel, shoe, and printing/publishing industries. Reemployment programs can be developed to customize service to UI claimants in a specific occupation or industry.
7. Improved services to profiled claimants. Additional resources can be used to implement approaches that increase the number of UI claimants selected and provide targeted services to produce positive outcomes. Projects to increase referrals and improve the intensity of reemployment services can be expanded.

## Specific Resources for Improving Reemployment Services

1. Assisting Unemployment Insurance Claimants: The Long-Term Impacts of the Job Search Assistance Demonstration. U.S. Department of Labor. 2000.  
<http://wdr.doleta.gov/owsdrr/00-2/00-02.pdf>
2. Evaluation of Worker Profiling and Reemployment Services: Final Report. Research and Evaluation Report Series 99D. U.S. Department of Labor 2000.
3. Evaluation of the Impact of Telephone Initial Claims Filing. Information Technology Support Center and Mathematica Policy Research, Inc. March 2000.  
<http://wdr.doleta.gov/owsdrr/00-3/00-3.pdf>
4. Evaluation of Worker Profiling and Reemployment Services Policy Workgroup: Final Report and Recommendations. 1999 <http://wdr.doleta.gov/opr/fulltext/99-profiling.pdf>
5. Worker Profiling and Reemployment Services Policy Workgroup: Final Report and Recommendations. 1999 <http://wdr.doleta.gov/opr/fulltext/wprswkgr.pdf>
6. Unemployment Insurance in the One-Stop System. Office of Workforce Security Occasional Paper Evaluation of the Maryland Unemployment Insurance Work Search Demonstration. U.S. Department of Labor, 1998.
7. Evaluation of Worker Profiling and Reemployment Services Systems: Report to Congress. U.S. Department of Labor, Employment and Training Administration, Office of Policy and Research, 1997. <http://wdr.doleta.gov/opr/fulltext/97-profiling.pdf>
8. The New Jersey Unemployment Insurance Reemployment Demonstration Project: Six-year Follow-up and Summary Report. Corson, Walter and Haimson, Joshua. Unemployment Insurance Occasional Paper 96-2, 1996.  
[http://ows.doleta.gov/dmstree/op/op96/op\\_02-96.pdf](http://ows.doleta.gov/dmstree/op/op96/op_02-96.pdf)